

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



## LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 87-127

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of S. 2197 . . . . .	.1
Digest of Public Law 87-127 . . . . .	.2



## INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 2197

- July 5, 1961 Sen. Humphrey and others introduced and Sen. Humphrey discussed S. 2197 which was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill and remarks of Sen. Humphrey.
- July 11, 1961 Senate committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 2197.
- July 12, 1961 Senate committee reported S. 2197 with amendments. S. Report No. 529. Print of bill and report.
- Senate passed S. 2197 as reported.
- Rep. Short introduced H. R. 8117 which was referred to the House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
- July 13, 1961 Rep. Nygaard introduced H. R. 8145 which was referred to the House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
- July 14, 1961 Senate reconsidered and passed S. 2197 with amendments.
- July 17, 1961 S. 2197 was referred to the House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as referred.
- July 20, 1961 House committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 2197.
- July 22, 1961 House committee reported S. 2197 with amendments. H. Report No. 753. Print of bill and report.
- July 31, 1961 House passed S. 2197 as reported.
- Aug. 3, 1961 Senate concurred in House amendments to S. 2197.
- Aug. 7, 1961 Approved: Public Law 87-127.



## DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 87-127

SALE OF CCC FEED IN DISASTER AREAS. Amends section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, which authorizes the Secretary to make feed available to distressed farmers in major disaster areas declared by the President under Public Law 875, 81st Cong. Permits more expeditious relief under section 407 in that the Secretary can make feed owned or controlled by CCC available at not less than 75 percent of the current support price for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of specified livestock in any area of the U. S. where, because of flood, drouth, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe, it is determined by the Secretary that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance.









- 3 -

13. RECREATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley inserting an article, "Four Seasons Vacationland: Mellen, Wis.," saying "The need for prime outdoor recreational areas for those caught in the web of metropolitan living is recognized by all business, intellectual and government leaders." pp. A5001-2
14. FOOD AND DRUGS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Sullivan inserting her testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation in support of H. R. 1235, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act relating to labeling provisions to prohibit worthless ingredients in special dietary foods, etc. pp. A5015-22

BILLS INTRODUCED

15. SOIL BANK. S. 2197, by Sen. Humphrey (for himself and others), to amend section 107(a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of Sen. Humphrey. pp. 11117-8

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- July 6: Establishment of Ozark Rivers National Monument, Mo. (includes national forest lands), S. Interior (Selke to testify).  
Farm bill and other pending bills, S. Agriculture (exec).  
Foreign aid authorization bill, S. Foreign Relations (exec) (Secretary Rusk to testify), and H. Foreign Affairs.  
Proposed Youth Opportunities Act (including Youth Conservation Corps), H. Education and Labor.
- July 18: National census of transportation, H. Post Office and Civil Service (Walsh, ERS, to testify).

o0o





New York, New York State Senate and Assembly.

1. Whereas it is clear we are the prime target of communism; that peaceful coexistence is a dream; that nothing is depraved which promotes communism, we, therefore, highly resolve: we intensify our efforts against global communism.

2. Whereas it was sensible policy to oppose admission of Red China to the United Nations; that there is a movement to reverse our stand without moral substance, we, therefore, most sincerely resolve: we strongly reaffirm our position against the seating of Communist China in that august body.

3. Whereas we expectantly face a vast space age; that the forces of evil are trying to blot out our very existence, we, therefore, prayerfully resolve: our policies at home and abroad be attuned to the end we merit and justify our leadership in the free world and gain the universal respect of all peoples.

4. Whereas it is undisputed there are 47 nations maintaining representation at the Vatican; that the benefits therefrom, not the imputed religious involvements, serve the ends of man, we, therefore, boldly resolve: we establish diplomatic relations with the Vatican State to better serve our own national destiny.

5. Whereas our impressionable younger citizens are an easy prey of those who wallow and flood the market with obscene literature, salacious magazines, immoral movies, and vicious TV programs, we, therefore, seriously resolve: such mediums must be supervised by stringent and competent law enforcement.

6. Whereas juvenile delinquency is torturing the soul of our nation and is casting a horrible blemish on our enviable way of life, we, therefore, solemnly resolve: there be made available for our youth sufficient wholesome programs conducive to its eradication from our national scene.

7. Whereas the choice of an education in a free society is fully consonant with our constitutional concept of equal rights and privileges; that education has reached onerous levels in qualified, nonprofit private schools because of insufficient funds, a situation which should be the concern of all, we, therefore, humbly resolve: in the name of our founding fathers, a system of national and State support be mandated to alleviate the burdens of such schools.

8. Whereas the New World was discovered, explored, colonized and settled by Christians dedicated to religious freedom, we, therefore, justifiably resolve: in the name of liberty, persecution in any form be soundly protested and freedom of belief vigorously promoted in the Western Hemisphere.

9. Whereas it is true all men are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights; that it is an undeniable historic fact the greatness of a nation is preserved only where there is one class of citizenship regardless of race, color, or creed, we, therefore, reflectively resolve: an enlightened program of civil rights be prudently enforced.

10. Whereas we are shamefully faced with organized crime, corruption, graft, and evils which beset law and order, we, therefore, vehemently resolve: there be a relentless prosecution of the laws for the protection of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,  
The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. AIKEN (for Mr. PASTORE), from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Gerald Johnson, of California, to be Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2195. A bill for the relief of the Lewis Invisible Machine Stitch Co., Inc., now known as Lewis Sewing Machine Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2196. A bill for the relief of Chin Yung Kao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 2197. A bill to amend section 107(a)(3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2198. A bill for the relief of Lise Marie Berthe Marguerite De Simone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; and

S.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution designating the 8-day period beginning on the 12th day of October of each year as "Patriotic Education Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the last above-mentioned joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 107(a)(3) OF SOIL BANK ACT, RELATING TO GRAZING ON CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. METCALF], the Senators from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK and Mr. YOUNG], my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce a bill to authorize the Department of Agriculture to permit grazing of or the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage areas adjacent to or near by designated disaster areas.

As my colleagues know, last week on June 29, the President signed into law S. 2113 (P.L. 87-62) to help bring relief to the farmers who have been so hard hit by the drought in the upper midwest. This bill authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage in designated disaster areas. The bill I offer today would expand this authority to include conservation reserve acreage near by the disaster areas.

To explain the purpose of the bill, I should like to say that it is one thing, as we have done, to permit hay to be taken from soil bank acres or conservation reserve acres in areas that are drought stricken if there is any hay. But right now there is a premium on hay in these drought areas, and the farmers in those areas are paying a premium

price. It seems to me that since the Government has already rented vast areas of land in the conservation reserve program, there might be, as my bill would permit, haying or grazing on some of the conservation reserve acres nearby or adjacent to the drought areas in order to alleviate the feed storage problem.

It is understood that the Department proposes to operate under this authority in the same manner it is presently operating within present designated disaster areas. Operations would be conducted under the direction of State and county ASC committees. Hay removal or grazing would be authorized by county committees upon application of the farmer who would agree to permit grazing only to victims of disaster areas or sell hay only to such persons at not to exceed a fair value established by the county committee. Conservation reserve payments on such land would be reduced by the committee's appraised value of the grazing or hay.

Mr. President, the prompt passage of this measure is required to help alleviate the grave hardship so many farmers are facing due to the devastating drought. I hope and pray that this bill will be quickly considered, passed, and signed into law.

I am not sure that the bill would meet all the requirements. Very frankly, I have had to prepare the bill by remote control. Like many other Senators, as I said, I went home over the weekend. I have asked the Department of Agriculture for technical assistance in designing the bill.

What I want done, and what I am sure my colleagues wish to have done, is to remove the ironical situation in which there is in one county or in an area of a State drought that is destroying all values, compelling farmers to sell their crops, cattle, livestock, and poultry at forced sales, while at the same time, in another area 50 miles away, by an accident of nature, there is some good hay on land that the Government has rented under the conservation reserve program.

It seems to me we ought to have enough sense to make that hay available at a cost that is reasonable or modest, or, if conditions would make it possible, to permit the bringing of the cattle into the conservation reserve acres for a limited period of time under the control of the ASC county committee. That is the farm committee that knows the situation in the particular area.

A similar bill will be introduced in the other body.

I appeal to both the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and to the similar committee in the House for prompt action, because passage of the bill 3 weeks from now would do no good. It would do no good to talk about this program some time later in August. By that time a good proportion of the cattle in the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and northern and western Minnesota, will be liquidated. The farmers will be through. The cost to the Government in loss of revenue will be fantastic, and the cost to the communities will be beyond calculation.



The small business people in these parts of the Midwest are suffering today. Delegations from those areas have been calling on me. I have received telegrams and telephone calls appealing to me, as I know other Senators have been appealed to also, to get something done. I feel a special sense of responsibility because this administration has made very strong commitments to the farm people of this land, and I know it will want to keep them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2197) to amend section 107(a)(3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### DESIGNATION OF PATRIOTIC EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating the 8-day period beginning on the 12th day in October of each year as Patriotic Education Week. This measure, Mr. President, is similar to Senate Joint Resolution 91, which I introduced in the 1st session of the 86th Congress. It is a companion measure to House Joint Resolution 458, introduced recently by Representative FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey's Fifth District.

This joint resolution would authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation inviting the American people to observe Patriotic Education Week in schools and other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies and activities. Patriotic Education Week would begin each year on Columbus Day and end with the anniversary of the British surrender to our revolutionary forces at Yorktown. This seems a most appropriate period, Mr. President, in which to call attention to our Nation's rich historical heritage.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 115) designating the 8-day period beginning on the 12th day of October of each year as Patriotic Education Week, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### U.S. DISARMAMENT AGENCY FOR WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], be added as cosponsors to S. 2180, a bill to establish a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security, which I introduced on June 29 on behalf of myself and other Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXTENSION OF SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 27, 1961, the names of Senators MOSS, MCGEE, YARBOROUGH, SMITH of Massachusetts, NEUBERGER, CARROLL, LONG of Missouri, ENGLE, CASE of South Dakota, GRUENING, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, FONG, and JACKSON were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2156) to expand and extend the saline water conversion program being conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators) on June 27, 1961.

#### NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of deLesseps S. Morrison, of Louisiana, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Council of the Organization of American States.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 30, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1748. An act to provide for the increased distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the Federal judiciary;

S. 1922. An act to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 2083. An act to correct a technical inaccuracy in the Act of May 19, 1961 (Public Law 87-36); and

S. 2154. An act to amend Public Law 85-626, as amended by Public Law 86-542, relating to dual rate contract agreements.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from radio broadcast by himself over station WGM, Chicago, relating to the challenges confronting the country.

Brochure entitled "Four Seasons Vacationland," published by the community of Mellen, Wis.

Article entitled "Ship Spells Hope for Asian People," published in the Milwaukee Journal of June 29, 1961, relating to the medical section of the people-to-people aid program.

By Mr. KEATING:

Address by Clifton W. Phalen, president, New York State Citizens Council on Traffic

Safety, and president, New York Telephone Co., delivered before New York State Conference of Mayors and other municipal officials, at Concord Hotel, Klamasha Lake, N.Y., June 19, 1961.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Editorial entitled "Berlin," published in a recent edition of the Wall Street Journal.

Article entitled "A Dirt Farmer So Poor He Had To Be a Success—Foss Looks Big, Even in Texas," written by Gary Cartwright and published in the Aberdeen, S. Dak., American-News, reprinted from the Dallas, Tex., Times-Herald, being a tribute to former Governor Foss of South Dakota.

By Mr. COOPER:

Excerpt from book "Freedom's Frontier," by Clarence K. Streit.

Article on the Berlin crisis, by Dr. Leo Szilard, of the University of Chicago.

#### FORMULATION OF POLICY IN REGARD TO BERLIN

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few days ago I made a suggestion in the Senate that the President of the United States or the Secretary of State consider the appointment of a committee, which might be called a consultative committee, to work under the Secretary of State in the formulation of policy regarding the Berlin crisis.

I have been interested to note that a number of newspapers have commented editorially and favorably on my suggestion and a number of political writers, including Mr. Arthur Krock of the New York Times, have written articles in regard to it.

I ask unanimous consent to have some of the editorials and articles printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of this statement.

An editorial appearing in the Houston Post in June 23, 1961; an article by Arthur Krock of the New York Times on June 23; and an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal on June 23.

I think the comments in the Louisville Courier-Journal are sound. But I must say in fairness, as I heard the speech of Senator BRIDGES, I did not consider that he charged Senator MANSFIELD with weakness, but rather praised him for his patriotic initiative, although disagreeing with him on the details of his speech.

There being no objection, the editorials and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I repeat today my suggestion that such a committee be formed and I hope my suggestion will be considered and acted upon by the President and Secretary of State.

When I made the suggestion in the Senate I said that it was not my purpose at that time to discuss the substance of our Berlin policy, but rather a means to provide unified support for it, and to insure full consideration of every aspect of the issue.

All of us know that our policy is based on two very firm principles. One is that the United States is in Berlin as a matter of right under the quadripartite agreement with the Soviet Union, and cannot be ousted from its position by any unilateral decision by the Soviet Union. The second basic principle is that we have committed ourselves to the defense

87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

# S. 2197

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 5 (legislative day, JULY 3), 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. WILEY) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

---

## A BILL

To amend section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended,  
4       is further amended by adding at the end thereof the follow-  
5       ing: "The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, per-  
6       mit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage  
7       adjacent to or nearby the disaster area. The authority of  
8       the Secretary to permit the removal of hay from conserva-  
9       tion reserve acreage because of damage, hardship, or suf-



1   fering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural  
2   disaster shall expire on June 30, 1962.”

3       SEC. 2. Section 107 (a) (4) of the Soil Bank Act is  
4   amended by adding at the end thereof the following: “Un-  
5   der the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve  
6   acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering  
7   caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster,  
8   the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the  
9   grazing of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby  
10  the disaster area.”





**A BILL**

To amend section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

By Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MERVOLF, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. WILEY

JULY 5 (legislative day, JULY 3), 1961  
Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Agriculture and Forestry





# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

### CONTENTS

Issued July 12, 1961  
For actions of July 11, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 115

Agricultural appropriations.....	12
Agricultural law.....	18
Annuities.....	13
Appropriations.....	4,12
Committee assignments.....	11
Education.....	14
Educational exchange.....	4
Electrification.....	8
Employment.....	15
Farm program.....	3
Food donations.....	9
Foreign currencies.....	4
Forestry.....	22
Hay.....	2
Legislative program.....	17
Life insurance.....	5

Livestock loans.....	1
Personnel.....	5,13,21
Recreation.....	16
Small business.....	10
Soil bank.....	2,20
Surplus commodities.....	9
Transportation.....	6
Youth conservation.....	15
Water.....	16
Water pollution.....	7,19

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Senate committee voted to report bill to permit removal of hay on conservation reserve acreage adjacent to disaster areas. Senate passed bill to continue authority for emergency livestock loans. House subcommittee voted to report proposed Youth Opportunities Act (including Youth Conservation Corps). Sen. Aiken criticized proposals to reduce food production.

### SENATE

- 1. LIVESTOCK LOANS.** Passed as reported S. 1710, to continue authority to make emergency livestock loans until Dec. 31, 1961, and to continue the authority to make supplemental advances to borrowers under the program until Dec. 31, 1961. pp. 11420-1
- 2. SOIL BANK; HAY.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report with amendment (but did not actually report) S. 2197, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage adjacent to disaster areas. p. D550
- 3. FARM PROGRAM.** Sen. Aiken discussed "the determined effort of the Department of Agriculture to reduce the agricultural production of the Nation, while at the same time the State Department is insistently urging long-term foreign commitments on an expanded scale," urged a reappraisal of the situation, and stated that "If the administration persists in its demand for less crop production, Congress simply cannot afford to authorize further commitments to supply food to foreign countries under long-term contracts." Sens. Morse and Javits commended Sen. Aiken's statement. pp. 11427-8  
Sen. Carlson inserted a Coffey County (Kan.) Farmers Union resolution favoring enactment of the omnibus farm bill. p. 11393



4. EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES. Continued debate on S. 1154, to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the educational and cultural exchange program (pp. 11411-19, 11421-7, 11429-30). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Mundt to require that the amount of foreign currencies used for educational and cultural exchange programs must be specifically provided for in appropriation acts (as reported the bill provided that foreign currencies may be used within such limits as may from time to time "be established by Congress") (pp. 11411-2). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Fulbright to provide that no appropriation authorized for these programs shall be increased or decreased by more than 10 percent by reason of transfers to any other appropriation available for these programs (pp. 11415-7).
5. PERSONNEL. Both Houses received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill "to amend the Federal Employees' Life Insurance Act"; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. pp. 11390, 11393  
The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment S. 1070, to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance for Federal employees (S. Rept. 527). p. 11394
6. TRANSPORTATION. The Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. 320, to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State (S. Rept. 528). p. 11394
7. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Young, Ohio, discussed the water pollution problem, saying "This is a problem as old as mankind itself, and here in America it is becoming a more serious one all the time ... I do not know of a bill that has won greater popular support than this measure to control the pollution that is fouling the water that we rely on so heavily." pp. 11405-6
8. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. McGee inserted two resolutions supporting Federal development of the upper Colorado River program. pp. 11407-8
9. SURPLUS COMMODITIES; FOOD DONATIONS. Passed without amendment S. 1873, to permit CCC commodities donated for use in home economics courses to also be used for training college students if the same facilities and instructors are used for training both high school and college students in home economics courses. p. 11420
10. SMALL BUSINESS. The Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments S. 836, the proposed Small Business Act Amendments of 1961. p. D550
11. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Agreed to without amendment S. Res. 171, to excuse Sen. Dirksen from further service on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and Sen. Fong from further service on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and to assign Sen. Dirksen to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Sen. Fong to the Judiciary Committee, and Sen. Tower to the Banking and Currency and to the Labor and Public Welfare Committees. p. 11392







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

## CONTENTS

Issued July 13, 1961  
For actions of July 12, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 116

Adjournment.....	11		
Administrative law.....	34		
Annuities.....	13		
Appropriations.....	5,12,35		
Atomic energy.....	10		
Budget.....	30		
Budgeting.....	7		
Cotton.....	22		
Disaster relief.....	2		
Drought relief.....	25		
Education.....	8		
Educational exchange..	4,10		
Electrification.....	19,21		
Employment.....	37		
Extension work.....	8		
Farm program.....	1		
Feed grains.....	24		
Forestry.....	9,23,36		
General supply fund....	28		
Grasshoppers.....	2		
Hay.....	2		
Inflation.....	7		
Lands.....	38		
Legislative program....	10		
Manpower.....	17		
Milk programs.....	8		
Patents.....	20		
Pay.....	6		
Per diem.....	4		
Personnel.....	6,13,31		
Procurement.....	28		
Public debt.....	33		
River compact.....	29		
School lunch.....	8		
Soil bank.....	2,27,32		
Travel.....	26		
Virgin Islands.....	18		
Youth corps.....	3		
Water resources.....	15		
Watersheds.....	14		
Wheat.....	16		

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Senate committee voted to report farm bill. Senate passed bill to permit removal of hay on conservation reserve acreage adjacent to disaster areas. Sen. Williams, Del., filed motion to reconsider this bill. House committee reported bill to extend date for holding wheat referendum. Senate subcommittee approved bill to establish Youth Conservation Corps.

## SENATE

1. **FARM PROGRAM.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report with amendments (but did not actually report) S. 1643, the omnibus farm bill. p. D556
2. **SOIL BANK; HAY.** Passed as reported S. 2197, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the removal of hay from, or grazing on, conservation reserve lands adjacent to or near disaster areas (pp. 11482-4). Sen. Williams, Del., entered a motion to reconsider the votes by which the bill was passed (p. 11505). The bill had been reported earlier with amendments by the Agriculture and Forestry Committee (S. Rept. 529) (p. 11438). The committee report explains the provisions of the bill as reported and passed as follows:

"This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit removal of hay from, or grazing on, conservation reserve lands adjacent to or near disaster areas. With the committee amendments it would also permit the sale by Commodity Credit Corporation of feed at any price not below 75 percent of the support price, in any disaster area where because of drought or other catastrophe, such action is needed; and provide for grasshopper control.

(over)



"The committee amendments --

"(1) restrict the hay harvesting and grazing provisions to hay to be used in the disaster area and to grazing by livestock normally maintained in the disaster area;

"(2) require the value of such hay or grazing to be deducted from the annual payment applicable to the acreage harvested or grazed;

"(3) permit the Secretary to reduce any deduction from the annual payment in the disaster area or adjacent or nearby area on account of permitted haying or grazing by up to \$1 to compensate the producer for expenditures for grasshopper control on the lands hayed or grazed; and

"(4) permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to make feed available at not less than 75 percent of the support price for maintenance of livestock in disaster areas. Such feed relief could be made only to farmers in financial need of such assistance.

"The authority to permit removal of hay would expire June 30, 1962."

3. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee "approved for full committee consideration with amendments S. 404, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps within the Department of Labor. One amendment would include in the bill the text of title II of S. 2036, relating to 'Youth Public Service Employment.'" pp. D556-7
4. EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES. Continued debate on S. 1154, to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the educational and cultural exchange program (pp. 11480-2, 11484-505). Sen. Miller submitted, but later withdrew, a proposed amendment which would have provided that members of boards, commissions or committees serving any Federal department or agency in an advisory or consultative capacity shall be allowed per diem at not to exceed \$10 per day (pp. 11502-3).
5. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration with amendments this bill, H. R. 7208. p. D556
6. PERSONNEL; PAY. Received from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures a report on Federal employment and pay for May 1961. pp. 11438-42
7. BUDGETING; INFLATION. Sen. Keating discussed the dangers of inflation and recommended steps be taken to curb inflation, including the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on the Budget to review proposed Federal expenditures. pp. 11474-6
8. EDUCATION. Sen. Morse inserted an address by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff discussing educational programs which included tables summarizing expenditure of Federal funds for educational purposes, including funds administered by this Department, and funds for agricultural extension work, colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, and school lunch and school milk programs. pp. 11505-10
9. FORESTRY. Sen. Dodd inserted several items commending the refusal of the Republic Electric Development Co., and Puget Sound Fabricators, Inc., of Seattle, Wash., to sell lumber sorting equipment to Russia. pp. 11511-2
10. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that a vote will be taken on S. 1154, the educational exchange bill, on Fri., the calendar will be called

## FEED DISASTER RELIEF

JULY 12, 1961.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,  
submitted the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 2197]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2197), to amend section 107(a)(3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit removal of hay from, or grazing on, conservation reserve lands adjacent to or near disaster areas. With the committee amendments it would also permit the sale by Commodity Credit Corporation of feed at any price not below 75 percent of the support price in any disaster area where, because of drought or other catastrophe, such action is needed; and provide for grasshopper control.

The committee amendments—

(1) restrict the hay harvesting and grazing provisions to hay to be used in the disaster area and to grazing by livestock normally maintained in the disaster area;

(2) require the value of such hay or grazing to be deducted from the annual payment applicable to the acreage harvested or grazed;

(3) permit the Secretary to reduce any deduction from the annual payment in the disaster area or adjacent or nearby area on account of permitted haying or grazing by up to \$1 to compensate the producer for expenditures for grasshopper control on the lands hayed or grazed; and

(4) permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to make feed available at not less than 75 percent of the support price for maintenance of livestock in disaster areas. Such feed relief could be made only to farmers in financial need of such assistance.

The authority to permit removal of hay would expire June 30, 1962.



## DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, July 10, 1961.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,*  
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Senate bill 2197, on which the Department has been requested to report, would amend sections 107(a) 3 and 4 of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, to provide that upon certification of necessity by the Governor of a State the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster within a designated disaster area, permit grazing or removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage in areas adjacent to or nearby the designated disaster area. The approval of the contract signer to permit grazing or removal of hay from such acreage would be required.

This Department recommends that the bill be passed with an amendment which would give the Secretary more flexible authority to supply livestock feed in emergency areas.

Under the soil bank program, the Secretary may permit grazing and the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage within a designated disaster area. The effect of S. 2197 is to provide the same authority to the Secretary applicable to conservation reserve acreage in areas adjacent to or nearby designated disaster areas and on the same basis.

Should this bill become law, it is contemplated that—

1. The Department will function under this authority in the same manner as it is presently operating within designated disaster areas.

2. Operations would be conducted under the direction of State and county ASC committees.

3. Hay removal or grazing would be authorized by the county committee upon application of the farmer who would agree to relet grazing rights to victims of the designated drought area or to sell hay only to such persons at not to exceed a fair value estimated by the county committee.

4. Conservation reserve payments otherwise due on such land would be reduced by the county committee's appraised value of the grazing of the hay.

There will be some additional administrative costs if this legislation is enacted. The additional cost will depend on the extent of natural disasters calling for such action. The additional expense would probably average about \$10 per farm taking advantage of the action authorized.

A proposed section 3 which would amend section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is attached. It provides that CCC on such terms as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem in the public interest, shall make feed owned or controlled by it available for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation or other catastrophe, the

Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance.

The Department is desirous of giving all reasonable assistance as promptly as possible to farmers in areas which have sustained damage from natural disasters. Existing legislation sometimes makes this impossible.

The proposed amendment would permit more expeditious relief under section 407 since assistance would not be confined to major disaster areas as determined under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and would permit the Secretary to make CCC stocks of feed grain available under such terms and conditions as are most fitting to the existing emergency.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

"SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the following: 'and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation or other catastrophe, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance.'"

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in *italic*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

#### SOIL BANK ACT

SEC. 107. (a) To effectuate the purposes of this title the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for periods of not less than three years with producers determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms covered by the contract wherein the producer shall agree:

\* \* \* \* \*

(3) Not to harvest any crop from the acreage established in protective vegetative cover, excepting timber (in accordance with sound forestry management) and wildlife or other natural products of such acreage which do not increase supplies of feed for domestic animals, and except that the Secretary may, with the approval of the contract signers, permit hay to be removed from such acreage if the Secretary, after certification by the Governor of the State in which such acreage is situated of the need for removal of hay from such acreage, determines that it is necessary to permit removal of hay from such acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster. *The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby the disaster area for use in the disaster area, the value of such hay, as determined by the Secretary, being deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage. The*

authority of the Secretary to permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage because of damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall expire on June 30, 1962. Any deduction made from conservation reserve payments because of any hay removal under this paragraph or because of grazing under section 107(a)(4) may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be reduced by an amount equal to any sums expended by the producer, but not to exceed one dollar per acre, for the purposes of grasshopper control operations on the acreage from which the hay is removed or which is grazed.

(4) Not to graze any acreage established in protective vegetative cover prior to January 1, 1959, or such later date as may be provided in the contract, except pursuant to the provisions of section 103(a)(3) hereof; and if such acreage is grazed at the end of such period, to graze such acreage during the remainder of the period covered by the contract in accordance with sound pasture management. Under the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the grazing of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby the disaster area by livestock normally maintained in the disaster area, the value of such grazing to be deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage.

SEC. 407. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at any price not prohibited by this section. In determining sales policies for basic agricultural commodities or storable nonbasic commodities, the Corporation should give consideration to the establishing of such policies with respect to prices, terms, and conditions as it determines will not discourage or deter manufacturers, processors, and dealers from acquiring and carrying normal inventories of the commodity of the current crop. The Corporation shall not sell any basic agricultural commodity or storable nonbasic commodity at less than 5 per centum above the current support price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges: *Provided*, That effective with the beginning of the marketing year for the 1961 crop, the Corporation shall not sell any upland or extra long staple cotton for unrestricted use at less than 15 per centum above the current support price for cotton plus reasonable carrying charges, except that the Corporation may, in an orderly manner and so as not to affect market prices unduly, sell for unrestricted use at the market price at the time of sale a number of bales of cotton equal to the number of bales by which the national marketing quota for such marketing year is reduced below the estimated domestic consumption and exports for such marketing year pursuant to the provisions of section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (A) sales for new or byproduct uses; (B) sales of peanuts and oilseeds for the extraction of oil; (C) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is a danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage; (E) sales for the purpose of establishing claims arising out of contract or against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity; (F) sales for export; (G) sales of wool; and (H) sales



for other than primary uses. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Corporation, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem in the public interest, shall make available any farm commodity or product thereof owned or controlled by it for use in relieving distress (1) in any area in the United States declared by the President to be an acute distress area because of unemployment or other economic cause if the President finds that such use will not displace or interfere with normal marketing of agricultural commodities and (2) in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855) *and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such area, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned by them.* Except on a reimbursable basis, the Corporation shall not bear any costs in connection with making such commodity available beyond the cost of the commodities to the Corporation in store and the handling and transportation costs in making delivery of the commodity to designated agencies at one or more central locations in each State. Nor shall the foregoing restrictions apply to sales of commodities the disposition of which is desirable in the interest of the effective and efficient conduct of the Corporation's operations because of the small quantities involved, or because of age, location, or questionable continued storability, but such sales shall be offset by such purchases of commodities as the Corporation determines are necessary to prevent such sales from substantially impairing any price-support program, but in no event shall the purchase price exceed the then current support price for such commodities. For the purposes of this section, sales for export shall not only include sales made on condition that the identical commodities sold be exported, but shall also include sales made on condition that commodities of the same kind and of comparable value or quantity be exported, either in raw or processed form.







87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# S. 2197

[Report No. 529]

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 5 (legislative day, JULY 3), 1961

MR. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JULY 12, 1961

Reported by Mr. TALMADGE, with amendments

[Insert the part printed in italic]

---

## A BILL

To amend section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2   *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3   That section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended,  
4   is further amended by adding at the end thereof the follow-  
5   ing: "The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, per-  
6   mit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage  
7   adjacent to or nearby the disaster area *for use in the disaster*  
8   *area, the value of such hay, as determined by the Secretary,*  
9   *being deducted from the annual payment applicable to such*  
10   *acreage.* The authority of the Secretary to permit the re-  
11   moval of hay from conservation reserve acreage because of

1 damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought,  
2 flood, or other natural disaster shall expire on June 30,  
3 1962. *Any deduction made from conservation reserve pay-*  
4 *ments because of any hay removal under this paragraph or*  
5 *because of grazing under section 107(a)(4) may, in the*  
6 *discretion of the Secretary, be reduced by an amount equal*  
7 *to any sums expended by the producer, but not to exceed*  
8 *one dollar per acre, for the purposes of grasshopper control*  
9 *operations on the acreage from which the hay is removed*  
10 *or which is grazed."*

11 SEC. 2. Section 107(a)(4) of the Soil Bank Act is  
12 amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Un-  
13 der the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve  
14 acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering  
15 caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster,  
16 the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the  
17 grazing of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby  
18 the disaster area *by livestock normally maintained in the*  
19 *disaster area, the value of such grazing to be deducted from*  
20 *the annual payment applicable to such acreage."*

21 SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as  
22 amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the  
23 end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the  
24 following: "and shall make feed owned or controlled by it  
25 available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the

1 *current support price for such feed (or a comparable price*  
2 *if there is no current support price) for assistance in the*  
3 *preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the*  
4 *United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurri-*  
5 *cane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other*  
6 *catastrophe in such area, the Secretary determines that an*  
7 *emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed*  
8 *to be made available only to persons who do not have, and*  
9 *are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without*  
10 *undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned*  
11 *by them."*

[Report No. 529]

---

---

# A BILL

---

---

To amend section 107(a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

---

---

By Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota

---

---

JULY 5 (legislative day, JULY 3), 1961

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JULY 12, 1961

Reported with amendments



passage of the bill (S. 1154) to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges.

### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader what else will be set for consideration on Friday other than the record vote on the pending bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. First, there will be no further votes tonight. Second, on Friday, at the conclusion of the vote on the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, the pending business, the oceanographic bill, in which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has an interest, will be taken up.

On Monday, very likely consideration of the oceanographic bill will be continued, and the calendar will be called.

On Tuesday it is tentatively anticipated—I know that the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Washington and other Senators are interested—the Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill will be considered.

On Wednesday, very likely—and again tentatively—the resolution relating to Reorganization Plan No. 5 will be considered. It is anticipated that it will be reported by the Committee on Government Operations on Monday next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that it is the hope of the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee that, while there may be some discussion of the oceanographic bill on Friday, no vote will be had until the following Monday. I do not know whether there has been any concurrence in that respect on the part of the leadership.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the situation develops in the fashion described by the minority leader, and elucidated by the senior Senator from Washington, there may well be a final vote on the oceanographic bill on Monday. However, I want all Members of the Senate to know that it is not my thought that they will be able to play hooky on Friday. Very likely there will be votes, and Senators will be expected to be in attendance.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not object to the unanimous consent agreement, although it will be impossible for me to be present on Friday. I should like the Record to indicate that, had I been able to be present, I would have voted in favor of the bill on final passage. I will be present on Monday, and I hope to have an opportunity to offer an amendment to the oceanographic bill. I believe there is an understanding that Senators will have an opportunity to offer amendments to the bill on Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If any development occurs which may impair the Senator's right to do so, I will be prepared on Friday to offer an amendment in his name; I will also do my best to see that he is given a live pair or pairs, if possible.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Delaware.

### NOTICE OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER VOTE ON S. 2197

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this morning the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported, and a few hours later the Senate passed, S. 2197.

It may well be that there will be no objection to the bill, but certainly if meritorious enough to justify its enactment it is at least worthy of examination.

As it is, I, as well as other Members of the Senate, have never had an opportunity either to read the bill or to study the proposal.

Therefore I now enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which S. 2197 was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the minority leader and myself, that the time allocated for the remainder of the evening be outside the allotted time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### "FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION"— ADDRESS BY SECRETARY RIBICOFF TO GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE OF JUNE 27, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during the floor debate upon the general aid to education bill, concern was expressed from time to time by Senators lest there be Federal control of our educational systems as a result of Federal aid.

It was and is my position that this fear has no foundation in fact. I have a high confidence in the wisdom of the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I am confident that his successors in that important post, whoever they may be, will share his awareness of the intent of Congress with respect to this point. Furthermore, Congress has at its command safeguards, both legislatively and through the appropriations process, which could effectively impress the executive branch with the firmness with which Congress holds to the conviction that Federal control of the operations of local school systems is undesirable.

Secretary Ribicoff made that point very ably in an address delivered at the Governors' conference on June 27, 1961.

It was a straight-from-the-shoulder speech which gained additional emphasis from the fact that as a former Governor of the great State of Connecticut, he was speaking from firsthand experience. He reminded the Governors of his own devotion to the values of States rights when he was the chief executive of Connecticut, and of the fact that, as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, he has insisted that every draft bill originating in his Department scrupulously

observe the legitimate prerogatives of the States.

He reviewed the history of Federal legislation for education and in the course of his exposition he stated:

I cite this historical development to put this discussion of financing our schools and colleges in proper perspective. I have another reason: that is to lay to rest the ghost of Federal control of education that seems to haunt every inquiry into educational finance which involves Federal financial participation.

In my 6 years as Governor of Connecticut and in my 5 months as the Cabinet officer having primary responsibility for Federal education policies and activities, I have never heard from a school principal, a superintendent, a mayor, or a Governor the slightest suggestion of Federal control of education. Quite the contrary, the Federal interest as I have seen it operate strengthens the capacity of State and local government to provide for the educational needs of the country.

There has been distributed to each of you a paper, prepared by our Department, which gives the details of Federal aid to education paid in each of your States, for fiscal 1959, the latest complete figures. The total annual expenditure, exclusive of loans, was nearly \$2½ billion. This year the figures are even higher. I want you to look at the funds each of your States received under all of these federally aided programs. I want you to tell me if you know of a single instance of Federal control of education because of these expenditures. And I would also like those who oppose the School Assistance Act of 1961 to tell me which of these existing programs they would like to have withdrawn.

Are you opposed to receiving funds for land-grant colleges, for vocational education, for National Defense Education Act loans and fellowships, for school construction and teachers' salaries in federally impacted areas?

Let us acknowledge the plain truth that after 175 years of Federal financial participation in the support of education, the direction, administration, control, and responsibility for education are all firmly in the hands of State, local, and private agencies. More significantly, there is no support that I know of in education, Government, politics, or public opinion for changing this emphasis. Therefore, let us discuss issues that have real substance.

Mr. President, this is a most significant figure that the Secretary presents. The Federal money for educational purposes, exclusive of loans, which was made available to the States for the fiscal year 1959, amounted to \$2½ billion. Yet this was done without Federal control.

In my judgment, Secretary Ribicoff has presented an irrefutable case against the scarecrow arguments of Federal control of our local school systems.

Because I am confident that many Senators are receiving correspondence from sincere citizens who wish to know the facts of this matter, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Ribicoff's remarks of June 27, 1961, together with the statistical tables setting forth the amounts received by each State for the various educational programs currently being administered be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address and tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:



## REMARKS BY ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

I am glad to have a chance to discuss aid to education with this group of realists. You would not hold the positions of leadership in your States had you not demonstrated the ability to be realistic about the problems your States face and realistic about the ways to solve them. And while each of you knows the value of a politically appealing slogan, you also know the hard realities of State and local government which slogans often disguise.

As I have read and listened to the current debate over the President's domestic proposals, one pattern has consistently emerged: The problems before us are the problems of the sixties, but the dialogue is spoken in the rhetoric of the twenties. The catchphrases and slogans of another era are being trumpeted across the land. In many of your States these familiar battle cries evoke a warm response.

But you and I know that the slogans will not solve the problems. Every Governor who has wrestled with his State budget knows that State and local tax resources alone cannot meet the increasing need for all basic State and local services. And so the Governors have in recent decades been eager participants with the Federal Government in the development of federally aided State programs to meet the varied needs of the people.

For brief intervals during each session of Congress, the States rights banner has been hauled down, while realistic Governors and Senators and Congressmen hammered our programs of Federal aid for highways, for welfare grants, for farm programs, for resource development—yes, and for education as well.

Then, with the legislation enacted and the allotment formulas adjusted to take account of variations in State financial resources, the banners are again unfurled, the battle cries are voiced, and invariably the battalions of critics mounting the best assault on Federal assistance are quartered in the States receiving the greatest share of Federal funds.

Let me speak frankly to you. As a Governor I knew full well the true value of States rights. I cherished those rights and greatly valued the opportunity that my State enjoyed to deal with its own problems in ways best suited to its people and their traditions. As a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare I am just as concerned about States rights as I ever was—just as concerned as any Governor here. I will always defend the right of every State to deal with local problems free of Federal interference. To this end I have insisted that every one of the many draft bills which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has sent to Congress since January has scrupulously observed the legitimate prerogatives of State government. This meaningful side of States rights I respect.

What I rejected as Governor and still reject as Secretary is the sloganeering aspect of States rights—the false cry of alarm that is raised whenever the Federal Government and the States join together to solve problems of national significance which the States alone cannot solve. I reject the claim that Federal funds mean Federal domination. I did not find this to be true in my State, and I think many of you who readily accept Federal funds and regularly seek increased grants will candidly admit the claim is spurious.

So let us hear these realities in mind as we consider the specific problem of education today. My firm belief is that State and local government—and private effort—cannot alone provide the means of attaining our goals in education, although their effort has been great and is constantly increasing. I am convinced that a still greater local, State,

and private effort is required and, in addition, that the Federal Government must provide increased financial assistance for this effort.

Let me make it completely clear there is nothing new about Federal financial assistance to improve education.

Our National Government has provided direct assistance for education during the whole period of our national life. In the Survey Ordinance of 1785—4 years prior to the adoption of the Constitution—the National Government provided for the reservation of lot No. 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools in every township. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, in providing for the distribution of Federal lands, declared that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

This early national support and encouragement of education has been followed by a long succession of Federal actions to strengthen our schools and colleges. We might never have had our splendid State systems of public higher education had it not been for the Land-Grant College Act of 1862. The Congress has provided additional Federal assistance for land-grant institutions periodically since 1862. The latest addition to such assistance was enacted only last year.

We might never have had the benefit of a universal system of vocational education had it not been for the National Vocational Education Acts, beginning in 1917. The Congress recognized an urgent educational need and assisted the States in meeting it through the public school systems.

Moreover, the educational level of the adult population of this country would not be nearly so high in 1961 had it not been for the GI bills of 1944 and 1952.

Today our Federal Government—in cooperation with State governments and public and private colleges and universities—is making a great contribution to education. Under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, through the programs of the National Science Foundation, the Department of Agriculture, and other departments and agencies, our schools and colleges are being helped to improve their programs in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and technical education; students are being helped financially so that they can finish college; graduate education is being strengthened and expanded to meet our educational, industrial, and other needs. These are all areas of crucial national concern.

Under the federally impacted area program, hundreds of millions of Federal funds have been spent in every one of your States for building schools and paying teachers' salaries.

I cite this historical development to put this discussion of financing our schools and colleges in proper perspective. I have another reason: that is to lay to rest the ghost of "Federal control of education" that seems to haunt every inquiry into educational finance which involves Federal financial participation.

In my 6 years as Governor of Connecticut and in my 5 months as the Cabinet officer having primary responsibility for Federal education policies and activities, I have never heard from a school principal, a superintendent, a mayor, or a Governor the slightest suggestion of Federal control of education. Quite the contrary, the Federal interest as I have seen it operate strengthens the capacity of State and local government to provide for the educational needs of the country.

There has been distributed to each of you a paper, prepared by our Department, which gives the details of Federal aid to education paid in each of your States—for fiscal 1959—the latest complete figures. The total annual expenditure, exclusive of loans, was nearly \$2½ billion. This year the figures are even higher. I want you to look at the funds

each of your States received under all of these federally aided programs. I want you to tell me if you know of a single instance of Federal control of education because of these expenditures. And I would also like those who oppose the School Assistance Act of 1961 to tell me which of these existing programs they would like to have withdrawn.

Are you opposed to receiving funds for land-grant colleges, for vocational education, for National Defense Education Act loans and fellowships, for school construction and teachers' salaries in federally impacted areas?

Let us acknowledge the plain truth that after 175 years of Federal financial participation in the support of education, the direction, administration, control, and responsibility for education are all firmly in the hands of State, local, and private agencies. More significantly, there is no support that I know of in education, government, politics, or public opinion for changing this emphasis. Therefore, let us discuss issues that have real substance.

Education is an area of national concern in which we must make a common national effort. For the Nation's interest in improving education in every State is clear. If education lags behind in any State, the entire Nation suffers. Our national responsibilities are too great to permit gaps in the pursuit of excellence. And with some 5 million of our population moving across State lines every year, every citizen is entitled to the assurance that first-rate educational opportunities exist in every one of the 50 States.

Let us face the fact that we have not met our needs. Today the classroom shortage stands at 142,000. Two million children attend schools in unsatisfactory facilities.

Teachers' salaries have improved but are still too low. The average earnings for 17 professions requiring college graduation are twice as high as the average for teachers. And today there are 90,000 teachers in our classrooms who fail to meet full professional certification requirements.

In the field of higher education we have to accommodate 1 million more students by 1965. During that period currently available resources for facilities alone will fall short by \$2.9 billion.

Our needs are great. And they are growing.

What of our capacity to meet these needs? During the past decade the States and local communities have made an extraordinary effort to keep pace with the Nation's snowballing educational problems. Yet each year—as you well know—the budgetary problems become more and more severe. While Federal tax dollars have increased 85 percent in the years since World War II, State and local communities have had to increase their tax revenues by 221 percent. While the Federal debt has increased by 6 percent, State and local debt has increased more than 300 percent since 1946. Property taxes, the traditional source of revenue for education, are in many areas rapidly approaching the limits of reasonableness. In some areas they may well have exceeded such limits.

What is more, the States vary greatly in the ability to finance education. The State with the highest income has almost 4 times the income per public elementary and secondary school pupil found in the State with the lowest income.

Inequality of ability is reflected in inequality of performance. The two States with the highest capacity and the smallest load are expanding in the order of 2½ times as many dollars per pupil annually as the two States with the lowest capacity and the heaviest load.

While it is possible to argue that a dollar may buy more in Alabama or Arkansas than in New York or New Jersey, it will not buy enough more to explain away a difference



suspect the conversational interchanges will be interesting, informative, and pertinent. Youth is usually inquisitive and has its own special way of cutting through hypocrisy and cant.

Each participant in this project will learn a little more about the world in which he lives. Each will discover what he probably already comprehends but possibly has not had the chance to learn by personal experience: That people the world over are pretty much the same—with the same drives, the same ambitions, and the same appreciation for the good, the bad, the beautiful, the ugly, even though they may differ by definition or by perception as to what these terms imply.

In this frightfully complicated, dreadfully confused, and eternally suspicious world, there is nothing quite like the person-to-person approach to provide fruitful information, to clear up misunderstandings and to quiet unfounded fears. In short, if there is ever to be an end to war, people are going to have to get to know each other.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia for support of this program and for his kind remarks about me. I appreciate what he has said.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am very grateful for the Senator's leadership in this vital endeavor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, am I to understand that we are working under allotted time at the present time, or not under allotted time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. While the Senator from Montana was out of the Chamber, the Senate, by unanimous consent, gave permission for several Senators, including the last Senator to speak, the Senator from West Virginia, to proceed without the time being charged to either side.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS OF THE REPUBLIC OF MALI

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes, irrespective of the current rule of procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? Without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, today the United States Senate has been honored with a visit by the Minister of State of the Republic of Mali, Mr. Jean Marie Kone. This distinguished gentleman occupies the second position of leadership in his new, growing, dignified, and respected country.

With him at lunch with the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which subcommittee I have the honor to be chairman, were the following gentlemen:

Mr. Mamadou Gologo, Secretary of State for Information and Tourism.

Mr. Assamou Diallo, a Member of the National Assembly of the Republic of Mali;

Mr. Sekou Kansave, a Member of the National Assembly of Mali;

Mr. Sory Ibrahima Keita, secretary general of a youth committee, and His Excellency the Ambassador from Mali.

These distinguished gentlemen have done us the honor of being our guests

and exchanging with us, which privilege and honor we enjoyed, the views which they hold and the views which we hold of the problems which their country faces, the problems which our country faces, problems common to all mankind.

It is for the purpose of paying our respects to these distinguished gentlemen from the Republic of Mali and to extend the good wishes of the U.S. Senate and of the people of the United States of America that I take this moment of time of the U.S. Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the membership of the Senate, the Chair wishes to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of the distinguished visitors referred to by the Senator from Tennessee, to welcome them to this tribunal of democracy and freedom, and to assure them that they are welcome. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1154) to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I inquire of the Senator from South Dakota whether amendment D is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is amendment D, offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Amendment D.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator wish to speak, or shall I proceed?

Mr. MUNDT. I should appreciate it if the Senator from Arkansas would take a little time to indicate whether perhaps he is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not wish to preclude the Senator from speaking, if he wishes to make a statement, but I am prepared to make a statement.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be happy to listen to the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment, which the able Senator from South Dakota dis-

cussed yesterday, would have the effect of deleting any authority for payment for any travel of any dependents. The bill, as introduced, provides authority for payment for travel expense, not for incidental expenses or daily upkeep.

The bill would not create a completely new authority. In the Comptroller General's letter of 1959, which has already been put into evidence and I believe is printed in the RECORD, there is reference to dependents, without a specification of whether the dependents would be of Americans or of persons of foreign nationality. That is an interpretation of the original act. It provided that dependents were contemplated and that payment for their travel expenses was perfectly legal.

The existence of the limited authority, which is inherent in the existing law—which is title VIII of the Smith-Mundt Act—noted by the Comptroller General, is merely specified and is not created by S. 1154. We are putting into the language what we believe to be the existing law, although it was not specified. The authority was derived as an interpretation of the existing language by the Comptroller General.

If the Senate accepts the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, deleting the reference to dependents, it would be interpreted, I am confident, at least by the House Committee on Appropriations, as a denial of the existing authority. In other words, it would be a retrogression in respect to authority now in existence.

As I have already stated, the language does not cover incidental expenses, but only travel expenses of authorized dependents; and the transport of their bodies, if they should die during the tour of service.

With respect to the administration of the existing law, only 156 dependents have been given travel expenses since the decision in 1959; and all of these have been dependents of Americans. That shows the limiting power of the appropriations process.

I should like to state for the record the regulations under which the existing authority is administered. Under the existing law, as interpreted by the Comptroller General, the Department of State already has authority to pay for the transportation of dependent members of the immediate family of the principal grantees. This authority is currently being exercised in accordance with the following rules:

First. Only those countries in which serious recruitment difficulties have been experienced are included in the plan.

Second. Only grantees in the lecturer or teacher categories assigned to these countries for a full academic year are eligible.

Third. Payment of dependents' travel is limited to one dependent member of the grantee's immediate family—which, in 9 cases out of 10, I think, would be his wife.

Fourth. To keep the cost of the program to a minimum, those grantees electing to receive dependents' travel receive two round-trip air fares at the tourist or economy rate, or comparable surface transportation. In other words,



they are simply given two tickets. That is what it amounts to. No incidental expenses apply.

The extent to which this authority continues to be used can be very effectively controlled, as it has been, through the appropriating process.

Mr. President, I think it would be an unduly harsh limitation to deprive the Department of this authority, which has been used very sparingly and very seldom at a very small cost. For us to put on a rigid restriction, which would prohibit the making of any exception to the usual rule of not allowing travel for dependents, would be unduly harsh. I hope the Senate will not accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE SOIL BANK ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield me 2 minutes on the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the majority leader, the Senator from Montana, 2 minutes from my time on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 498. I do so because of the serious drought and grasshopper condition in the Northern Plains States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2197) to amend section 107(a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2197) to amend section 107(a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "area", to insert "for use in the disaster area, the value of such hay, as determined by the Secretary, being deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage"; on page 2, line 5, after "1962", to insert "Any deduction made from conservation reserve payments because of any hay removal under this paragraph or because of grazing under section 107(a) (4) may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be reduced by an amount equal to any sums expended by the producers, but not to exceed one dollar per acre, for the purposes of grasshopper control operations on the acreage from which the hay is removed or which is grazed"; in line 20, after the word "area", to insert "by livestock normally maintained in the disaster area, the value of such grazing to be deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage"; and, after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end of the

fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the following: "and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such area, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned by them."

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 107(a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby the disaster area for use in the disaster area, the value of such hay, as determined by the Secretary, being deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage. The authority of the Secretary to permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage because of damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall expire on June 30, 1962. Any deduction made from conservation reserve payments because of any hay removal under this paragraph or because of grazing under section 107(a) (4) may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be reduced by an amount equal to any sums expended by the producer, but not to exceed one dollar per acre, for the purposes of grasshopper control operations on the acreage from which the hay is removed or which is grazed."*

SEC. 2. Section 107(a) (4) of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Under the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the grazing of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby the disaster area by livestock normally maintained in the disaster area, the value of such grazing to be deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage."

SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the following: "and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such area, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned by them."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded as original text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill which is before the Senate has been cosponsored by the Senators from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senators from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK and Mr. YOUNG], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senators from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT and Mr. CASE].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpt from the report (No. 529) is as follows:

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit removal of hay from, or grazing on, conservation reserve lands adjacent to or near disaster areas. With the committee amendments it would also permit the sale by Commodity Credit Corporation of feed at any price not below 75 percent of the support price, in any disaster area where because of drought or other catastrophe, such action is needed; and provide for grasshopper control.

The committee amendments—

(1) restrict the hay harvesting and grazing provisions to hay to be used in the disaster area and to grazing by livestock normally maintained in the disaster area;

(2) require the value of such hay or grazing to be deducted from the annual payment applicable to the acreage harvested or grazed;

(3) permit the Secretary to reduce any deduction from the annual payment in the disaster area or adjacent or nearby area on account of permitted haying or grazing by up to \$1 to compensate the producer for expenditures for grasshopper control on the lands hayed or grazed; and

(4) permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to make feed available at not less than 75 percent of the support price for maintenance of livestock in disaster areas. Such feed relief could be made only to farmers in financial need of such assistance.

The authority to permit removal of hay would expire June 30, 1962.

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, July 10, 1961.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Senate bill 2197, on which the Department has been requested to report, would amend sections 107(a) 3 and 4 of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, to provide that upon certification of necessity by the governor of a State the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary to alleviate damage, hardship or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster within a designated disaster area, permit grazing or removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage in areas adjacent to or nearby the designated disaster area. The approval of the contract signer to permit grazing or removal of hay from such acreage would be required.

This Department recommends that the bill be passed with an amendment which would give the Secretary more flexible authority to supply livestock feed in emergency areas.



Under the soil bank program, the Secretary may permit grazing and the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage within a designated disaster area. The effect of S. 2197 is to provide the same authority to the Secretary applicable to conservation reserve acreage in areas adjacent to or nearby designated disaster areas and on the same basis.

Should this bill become law, it is contemplated that:

1. The Department will function under this authority in the same manner as it is presently operating within designated disaster areas.

2. Operations would be conducted under the direction of State and county ASC committees.

3. Hay removal or grazing would be authorized by the county committee upon application of the farmer who would agree to relet grazing rights to victims of the designated drought area or to sell hay only to such persons at not to exceed a fair value estimated by the county committee.

4. Conservation reserve payments otherwise due on such land would be reduced by the county committee's appraised value of the grazing or the hay.

There will be some additional administrative costs if this legislation is enacted. The additional cost will depend on the extent of natural disasters calling for such action. The additional expense would probably average about \$10 per farm taking advantage of the action authorized.

A proposed section 3 which would amend section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is attached. It provides that CCC on such terms as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem in the public interest, shall make feed owned or controlled by it available for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance.

The Department is desirous of giving all reasonable assistance as promptly as possible to farmers in areas which have sustained damage from natural disasters. Existing legislation sometimes makes this impossible.

The proposed amendment would permit more expeditious relief under section 407 since assistance would not be confined to major disaster areas as determined under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and would permit the Secretary to make CCC stocks of feed grain available under such terms and conditions as are most fitting to the existing emergency.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the following: "and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation or other catastrophe, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance."

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

#### SOIL BANK ACT

SEC. 107. (a) To effectuate the purposes of this title the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for periods of not less than three years with producers determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms covered by the contract wherein the producer shall agree;

(3) Not to harvest any crop from the acreage established in protective vegetative cover, excepting timber (in accordance with sound forestry management) and wildlife or other natural products of such acreage which do not increase supplies of feed for domestic animals, and except that the Secretary may, with the approval of the contract signers, permit hay to be removed from such acreage if the Secretary, after certification by the Governor of the State in which such acreage is situated of the need for removal of hay from such acreage, determines that it is necessary to permit removal of hay from such acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster. *The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby the disaster area for use in the disaster area, the value of such hay, as determined by the Secretary, being deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage. The authority of the Secretary to permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage because of damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall expire on June 30, 1962. Any deduction made from conservation reserve payments because of any hay removal under this paragraph or because of grazing under section 107(a)(4) may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be reduced by an amount equal to any sums expended by the producer, but not to exceed one dollar per acre, for the purposes of grasshopper control operations on the acreage from which the hay is removed or which is grazed.*

(4) Not to graze any acreage established in protective vegetative cover prior to January 1, 1959, or such later date as may be provided in the contract, except pursuant to the provisions of section 103(a)(3) hereof; and if such acreage is grazed at the end of such period, to graze such acreage during the remainder of the period covered by the contract in accordance with sound pasture management.

*Under the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the grazing of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby the disaster area by livestock normally maintained in the disaster area, the value of such grazing to be deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage.*

#### AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

SEC. 407. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at any price not prohibited by this section. In determining sales policies for basic agricultural commodities or storable nonbasic commodities the Corporation should give consideration to the establishing of such policies with respect to prices, terms, and conditions as it determines will not discourage or deter manufacturers, processors, and dealers from acquiring and carrying normal inventories of the commodity of the current crop. The Corporation shall not sell any basic agricultural commodity or storable nonbasic commodity at less than 5 per centum above the current support price for such com-

modity, plus reasonable carrying charges: *Provided*, That effective with the beginning of the marketing year for the 1961 crop, the Corporation shall not sell any upland or extra long staple cotton for unrestricted use at less than 15 per centum above the current support price for cotton plus reasonable carrying charges, except that the Corporation may, in an orderly manner and so as not to affect market prices unduly, sell for unrestricted use at the market price at the time of sale a number of bales of cotton equal to the number of bales by which the national marketing quota for such marketing year is reduced below the estimated domestic consumption and exports for such marketing year pursuant to the provisions of section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (A) sales for new or byproduct uses; (B) sales of peanuts and oilseeds for the extraction of oil; (C) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is a danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage; (E) sales for the purpose of establishing claims arising out of contract or against persons who have committed fraud misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity; (F) sales for export; (G) sales of wool; and (H) sales for other than primary uses. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Corporation, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem in the public interest, shall make available any farm commodity or product thereof owned or controlled by it for use in relieving distress (1) in any area in the United States declared by the President to be an acute distress area because of unemployment or other economic cause if the President finds that such use will not displace or interfere with normal marketing of agricultural commodities and (2) in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855) and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such area, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned by them. Except on a reimbursable basis, the Corporation shall not bear any costs in connection with making such commodity available beyond the cost of the commodities to the Corporation in store and the handling and transportation costs in making delivery of the commodity to designated agencies at one or more central locations in each State. Nor shall the foregoing restrictions apply to sales of commodities the disposition of which is desirable in the interest of the effective and efficient conduct of the Corporation's operations because of the small quantities involved, or because of age, location or questionable continued storability, but such sales shall be offset by such purchases of commodities as the Corporation determines are necessary to prevent such sales from substantially impairing any price-support program, but in no event shall the purchase price exceed the then current support price for such commodities. For the purposes of this section,



sales for export shall not only include sales made on condition that the identical commodities sold be exported, but shall also include sales made on condition that commodities of the same kind and of comparable value or quantity be exported, either in raw or processed form.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the bill reflects a very practical situation. Emergency legislation was passed earlier to permit haying and grazing of lands in the soil bank, but was limited in its interpretation to the so-called drought-disaster counties, particularly in the Northwest. Obviously the needs for hay and feed could only be supplied by utilizing lands where grass had grown. The present bill is intended to correct the interpretation that the earlier legislation received during its history in the House, as I understand, where it had been explained that the haying would take place only in the disaster counties. Obviously the relief had come from counties which were disaster counties. The present measure is intended to permit haying and grazing in areas adjacent to the disaster counties on the so-called soil bank acres. Through action of the committee, several safeguards have been written into the measure to prevent the use of the forage from destroying the natural markets. At the same time the amendments are designed to guard against exorbitant pricing for those who are suffering disaster. I think the proposed legislation is well conceived and should be promptly passed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words in explanation of the emergency drought bill, of which I am a coauthor, and the amendments which were reported from the committee, which go beyond the utilization of hay in areas adjacent to the disaster areas. Two very important additions were added by the committee which are of importance to the Senate, because they would be of great help around the country in meeting disaster conditions, whether caused by drought, flood, hurricane, severe prairie fire, grasshopper plague, or other cause.

The first amendment would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make available to producers in the disaster areas Government feeds at a price set at not to exceed 75 percent of the 1961 price-support program.

This procedure would make feed available to producers who have been under severe economic pressure because of natural disaster, and provide an opportunity for them to keep their herds together, and an opportunity to do something to provide for themselves the feed which nature has denied them through this economic disaster. This is a projection of what the Senate did in the previous Congress when it passed a bill introduced by the senior Senator from South Dakota to meet an emergency in the Midwest, and which provided a somewhat analogous provision for those producers. The program has worked out very successfully. I am glad the experiment initiated by my bill has worked so effectively.

The second addition made by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

provides that from the money which is received from the purchase of hay from the adjacent areas, the Secretary of Agriculture would be given permissive authority to allocate not to exceed \$1 an acre to help eliminate the grasshopper menace in those areas which have been harvested. This suggestion was brought to the attention of the committee by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], who has pointed out from his experience as a farmer that when hay is cut in such areas, a refuge which has been found by the grasshoppers is destroyed, and the grasshoppers immediately hop or fly out of the cut fields into the adjacent fields and begin their depredations.

As a consequence, it was thought wise by the committee to add a provision which would give the Secretary of Agriculture, under these circumstances, permissive authority to allocate not to exceed \$1 an acre to the farmers in that area so that they can spray the grasshoppers and do whatever is necessary to help eliminate the spread of the grasshopper menace to adjacent areas. Senator Young deserves real credit for his leadership on this matter.

I thought the Senate should know about those two important provisions added by the committee because they, too, help to meet the emergency situations confronted by ranchers and farmers in the disaster area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time, and passed.

#### MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1154) to provide for the improvement and strengthening of the international relations of the United States by promoting better mutual understanding among the peoples of the world through educational and cultural exchanges.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with regard to the pending amendment, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader. I think the amendment refers to an important departure upon which the Senate should voice its collective judgment. I am not so much concerned about utilizing the remaining 22 minutes of my time as I am in having a ye-a-and-nay vote on the amendment. If we can contrive a way, by unanimous consent or otherwise, to bring Senators to the floor in order to have a ye-a-and-nay vote on my amendment, I am prepared to yield back the majority of the time which has been allocated to this side.

I do not know how we can do so under the circumstances, but I seek the guidance and cooperation of the majority leader on that point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes. I regret that it is necessary to press the amendment, but if we are to keep this program in the form in which it has operated so successfully for the past dozen years, and if we are not going to open the door entirely to the payment for bringing innumerable dependents to this country, it is essential that the amendment be adopted.

The Senator from Arkansas has just read from a letter written by the Comptroller General. Under the interpretation of the law as it now exists, he is exactly right, that these limitations on dependents have prevailed. However, the proposed language removes these limitations. As a matter of fact, the committee report itself says—and I quote from page 13 of the report:

The section—

That is the section under consideration now—

The section also is intended to broaden the existing authority to provide for certain expenses of accompanying dependents, whose travel and transportation may now be provided to a limited degree under existing legislation.

Let us take a look at the bill to see how much we will broaden it. We will broaden it to include the purposes of section 102 of the bill now before us, S. 1154. What does the section provide? It provides for "visits and interchanges between the United States and other countries of leaders, experts in fields of specialized knowledge or skill, and other influential or distinguished persons."

That language expands the subject far beyond the occasional payment for the visits by dependents who are visiting scholars or professors, which is now authorized under existing legislation.

Then we read in the next subsection a further expansion, which could place a great burden on the taxpayers by bringing other dependents to this country under the proposed program, because subsection (ii) includes "tours in countries abroad by creative and performing artists and athletes from the United States, individually and in groups, representing any field of the arts, sports, or any other form of cultural attainment."

It provides not only for the exchange, with dependents, but also for the reverse programs. It provides for any people coming from abroad engaging in the fields of arts, sports, or any other form of cultural attainment. They may have their dependents paid for regardless of the number and regardless of the length of their stay.

87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 8117

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 12, 1961

Mr. SHORT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To amend section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended,  
4       is further amended by adding at the end thereof the follow-  
5       ing: "The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary,  
6       permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acre-  
7       age adjacent to or nearby the disaster area for use in the dis-  
8       aster area, the value of such hay, as determined by the Sec-  
9       retary, being deducted from the annual payment applicable  
10      to such acreage. The authority of the Secretary to permit  
11      the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage be-



1 cause of damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe  
2 drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall expire on June  
3 30, 1962. Any deduction made from conservation reserve  
4 payments because of any hay removal under this paragraph  
5 or because of grazing under section 107 (a) (4) may, in the  
6 discretion of the Secretary, be reduced by an amount equal  
7 to any sums expended by the producer, but not to exceed \$1  
8 per acre, for the purposes of grasshopper control operations  
9 on the acreage from which the hay is removed or which is  
10 grazed.”

11 SEC. 2. Section 107 (a) (4) of the Soil Bank Act is  
12 amended by adding at the end thereof the following: “Under  
13 the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve  
14 acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering  
15 caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster,  
16 the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the  
17 grazing of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby  
18 the disaster area by livestock normally maintained in the  
19 disaster area, the value of such grazing to be deducted from  
20 the annual payment applicable to such acreage.”

21 SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as  
22 amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the  
23 end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the  
24 following: “and shall make feed owned or controlled by it  
25 available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the

1 current support price for such feed (or a comparable price  
2 if there is no current support price) for assistance in the  
3 preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the  
4 United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurri-  
5 cane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other  
6 catastrophe in such area, the Secretary determines that an  
7 emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed  
8 to be made available only to persons who do not have, and  
9 are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade with-  
10 out undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock  
11 owned by them.”



87<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

H. R. 8117

A BILL

To amend section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank  
Act, as amended.

By Mr. SHORT

JULY 12, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture





87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 8145

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 13, 1961

Mr. NYGAARD introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To amend section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended,  
4       is further amended by adding at the end thereof the follow-  
5       ing: "The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, per-  
6       mit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage  
7       adjacent to or nearby the disaster area for use in the disaster  
8       area, the value of such hay, as determined by the Secretary,  
9       being deducted from the annual payment applicable to such  
10      acreage. The authority of the Secretary to permit the  
11      removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage because

1 of damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought,  
2 flood, or other natural disaster shall expire on June 30, 1962.  
3 Any deduction made from conservation reserve payments  
4 because of any hay removal under this paragraph or because  
5 of grazing under section 107 (a) (4) may, in the discretion  
6 of the Secretary, be reduced by an amount equal to any  
7 sums expended by the producer, but not to exceed \$1 per  
8 acre, for the purposes of grasshopper control operations on  
9 the acreage from which the hay is removed or which is  
10 grazed.”

11 SEC. 2. Section 107 (a) (4) of the Soil Bank Act is  
12 amended by adding at the end thereof the following: “Under  
13 the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve  
14 acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering  
15 caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster,  
16 the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit  
17 the grazing of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or  
18 nearby the disaster area by livestock normally maintained in  
19 the disaster area, the value of such grazing to be deducted  
20 from the annual payment applicable to such acreage.”

21 SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949,  
22 as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at  
23 the end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the  
24 following: “and shall make feed owned or controlled by it  
25 available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the



1 current support price for such feed (or a comparable price  
2 if there is no current support price) for assistance in the  
3 preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the  
4 United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurri-  
5 cane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other  
6 catastrophe in such area, the Secretary determines that an  
7 emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed  
8 to be made available only to persons who do not have, and  
9 are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade  
10 without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for live-  
11 stock owned by them."

87TH CONGRESS  
1ST Session

H. R. 8145

## A BILL

To amend section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank  
Act, as amended.

By Mr. NYGAARD

JULY 13, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 8149

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 13, 1961

Mr. BERRY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## A BILL

To amend section 107 (a) (3) and section 107 (a) (4) of the Soil Bank Act and section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended,  
4       is further amended by adding at the end thereof the fol-  
5       lowing: "The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary,  
6       permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acre-  
7       age adjacent to or nearby the disaster area for use in the  
8       disaster area, the value of such hay, as determined by the  
9       Secretary, being deducted from the annual payment applica-  
10      ble to such acreage. The authority of the Secretary to per-

1 mit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage  
2 because of damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe  
3 drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall expire on  
4 June 30, 1962. Any deduction made from conservation  
5 reserve payments because of any hay removal under this  
6 paragraph or because of grazing under section 107 (a) (4)  
7 may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be reduced by an  
8 amount equal to any sums expended by the producer, but  
9 not to exceed \$1 per acre, for the purposes of grasshopper  
10 control operations on the acreage from which the hay is  
11 removed or which is grazed.”

12 SEC. 2. Section 107 (a) (4) of the Soil Bank Act is  
13 amended by adding at the end thereof the following: “Under  
14 the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve acre-  
15 age in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused  
16 by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, the Secre-  
17 tary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the grazing  
18 of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby the dis-  
19 aster area by livestock normally maintained in the disaster  
20 area, the value of such grazing to be deducted from the an-  
21 nual payment applicable to such acreage.”

22 SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as  
23 amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the  
24 end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the  
25 following: “and shall make feed owned or controlled by it



1 available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the  
2 current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if  
3 there is no current support price) for assistance in the pres-  
4 ervation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the  
5 United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurri-  
6 cane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other  
7 catastrophe in such area, the Secretary determines that an  
8 emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to  
9 be made available only to persons who do not have, and are  
10 unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without  
11 undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned  
12 by them."

87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 8149

## A BILL

To amend section 107 (a) (3) and section 107 (a) (4) of the Soil Bank Act and section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

By Mr. BERRY

JULY 13, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

## CONTENTS

Issued July 17, 1961  
For actions of July 14, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 118

Adjournment.....	18
Agricultural appropriations.....	3
Appropriations.....	3,4,22
Atomic energy.....	22
Conflict of interest.....	28
Cultural exchanges.....	32
Durum wheat.....	2
Expenditures.....	23
Farm labor.....	10
Farm loans.....	29
Farm program.....	7,21
Food for peace.....	9
Foreign aid.....	34
Foreign trade.....	25
Hay.....	1
Horsemeat.....	16
Monopolies.....	26
Natural resources.....	27

Per diem.....	5
Peace Corps.....	15
Personnel.....	5,28,30
Procurement.....	26
Reclamation.....	20
Retirement.....	5,17
St. Lawrence Seaway.....	19
Soil bank.....	1
Travel.....	5
Tariffs.....	13,33
Textiles.....	11
Transportation.....	31
Youth corps.....	14
Water pollution.....	12
Water resources.....	6,24,27
Watersheds.....	8

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Senate reconsidered and passed bill to permit removal of hay on conservation reserve acreage adjacent to disaster areas. Conferees agreed to file report on agricultural appropriation bill. Senate committee reported bill to increase per diem travel rates. Senate passed bill to continue exemption of durum wheat production in certain Calif. counties from allotments and quotas. Senate subcommittee voted to report HEW and independent offices appropriation bills. Senate received from President and Sen. Anderson introduced and discussed water resources planning bill.

## SENATE

- 1. SOIL BANK; HAY.** Reconsidered and passed with amendments S. 2197, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the removal of hay from, or grazing on, conservation reserve lands adjacent to or near disaster areas (pp. 11694, 11700-07, 11715). This bill was passed on July 12, but Sen. Williams, Del., later entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. Agreed to amendments by Sen. Williams, Del., to provide that the President, rather than the Secretary of Agriculture, shall have authority to determine when areas shall be declared disaster areas, and to provide that the provisions of the bill shall expire on June 30, 1962.
- 2. DURUM WHEAT.** Passed as reported S. 1107, to continue the exemption of production of Durum wheat in portions of Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif., from acreage allotments and marketing quota restrictions. p. 11719
- 3. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962.** The "Daily Digest" states, "Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House passed versions of H. R. 7444, fiscal 1962 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and related agencies." p. D572



APPROPRIATIONS.

1. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report with amendments to the full committee H. R. 7445, fiscal 1962 appropriations for independent offices. p. D570  
A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report with amendments to the full committee H. R. 7035, fiscal 1962 appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. p. D570
5. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with <sup>out</sup> amendment H. R. 5432, to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund (S. Rept. 545), and with amendment H. R. 3279, to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business (S. Rept. 544). p. 11640
6. WATER RESOURCES. Received from the President a proposed bill "to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 11636  
Received from the Governors' Conference a resolution favoring Congressional consent to the Delaware River Basin Compact and the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact. p. 11640
7. FARM PROGRAM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee has issued a summary of S. 1643, the omnibus farm bill, as it was ordered reported by the Committee on July 12 (see Digest 116). Attached to this Digest is a copy of the summary issued by the Committee.  
Received from the Wisconsin Better Government Committee a resolution protesting against S. 1643 and H. R. 6400, the omnibus farm bills; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. p. 11637
8. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement on Big Creek, Ark.; Ulatis Creek, Calif.; South Branch Park River, Conn.; Indian Creek and Pony Creek, Iowa; Frog Creek, Kans.; Big Reedy Creek and Humphrey-Clanton Creek, Ky.; South Branch Cass River, Mich; Plum Creek, Nebr.; Upper Red Rock Creek, Okla.; Brodhead Creek, Pa.; Anasco River, Puerto Rico; and Houser Creek, Tenn.; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. p. 11636  
Received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement on Big Sandy Creek (supplement), Colo.; South River, Ga.; Middle Fork of Anderson River, Ind.; Middle-South Branch Forest River, N. Dak.; and Twin Parks, Wis., to Public Works Committee. p. 11637
9. FOOD FOR PEACE. Sen. Neuberger inserted an address by Sen. Humphrey at the First National Conference of the American Food for Peace Council in support of the food for peace program. pp. 11661-4  
Sen. Keating inserted an article, "Peace Corps Program in India - Literacy House," and said "I am very happy to report that ... under the terms of Public Law 480, \$151,000 in local currency will be made available to supplement this work." pp. 11687-8
10. MIGRANT LABOR. Sen. Neuberger inserted an article, "Voiceless People," and said, "It has long been the hope and aspiration of many conscientious Americans to extend economic and social justice to our migratory farmworkers." pp. 11664-5



they already have exerted considerable influence. Consumers and some doctors have begun to show a skepticism about the public service facade of the drug industry. More important, as a consequence of the hearings, the prices of broad-spectrum antibiotics, for example, were cut by about 15 percent after having remained unchanged for some 10 years. Senator KEFAUVER has estimated that such reductions already have saved consumers \$55 million.

Also stemming from the hearings have been grand jury investigations and antitrust actions against certain producers of antibiotics and tranquilizer drugs. In February, the Federal Trade Commission indicated intentions to introduce legislation requiring inclusion of full disclosure of possible side-effects in all prescription-drug advertisements. And the Food and Drug Administration has introduced new regulations requiring fuller disclosure of possible undesirable side effects on labels of prescription drugs.

#### GENERIC NAMES VERSUS BRAND NAMES

Before much headway can be made in generic-name prescribing, two conditions have to be met. First, it is important to make the generic names as easy to remember as trade names. At present, generic names, usually impossible tongue-twisters, are chosen in the main by the drug companies which develop them; it would seem desirable to place this responsibility in the hands of an independent authority, such as the World Health Organization, the FDA, or a professional organization.

Second, physicians must have assurance that every drug put up for sale meets adequate standards of purity and potency. At the present time, the FDA has resources enough to test the quality of only a small fraction of the drugs sold in interstate commerce. Adequate funds and staff must be provided for a more comprehensive job of testing drugs and supervising manufacturing methods.

It should be known, however, that not all drugs are less expensive under their generic names. When a company develops a new drug, a patent is issued on it. Then, if the company licenses one or more other companies to sell the drug under other brand names, the price structure established usually allows for no competition. In such circumstances, it makes little or no difference to the patient's pocketbook whether the doctor uses the generic name or the trade name. The degree to which large brand-name pharmaceutical companies have used patent laws to preserve their privileged position in the marketplace was revealed in much of the testimony before the Kefauver Committee.

This is not to say that the drug industry is not highly competitive. But its competitive efforts are expended less in achieving price reductions than in capturing the prescription pads of the busy doctors who, in most instances, cannot remember the generic names or, for that matter, cannot judiciously weigh the real properties of drugs against the promotional claims. The doctors' problem in this respect is heightened by a major loophole in present laws regulating new drugs. A drug company need not provide adequate proof of efficacy of a prescription drug. A new-drug application is granted to the manufacturer if there is plausible evidence of its safety in the dosage recommended on the label. It would seem self-evident that proof of efficacy as well as safety needs to be required.

#### "RESEARCH" AND "EDUCATION"

Research expenditures have been cited by the manufacturers as a major factor contributing to current high drug prices. The argument usually runs that the drug industry is engaged in a feverish research program designed to save life and health. It is true that some drugs developed by pharmaceutical-company chemists are valuable contributions to medical practice. However,

expenditures for "research," even with the most favorable definition of this term, by the 20 largest drug companies have been only about 6½ percent of sales. Selling expenditures account for about 25 percent of sales; about 4 times the amount spent on research. The great amounts spent on promotion are defended as postgraduate "education" for physicians.

Dr. Austin Smith, formerly editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association and now president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, claimed in a statement to the AMA Journal that "Detail men form an indispensable link between the doctor and new knowledge that can help or save a patient. \* \* \* In a few minutes the detail men can acquaint the doctor with the capacities and the limitations of a new drug."

But Dr. George E. Moore, director of the Roswell Park Memorial Institute in Buffalo, a leading surgeon, teacher, and investigator, in a letter to the AMA Journal, stated:

"This just is not possible. Most detail men do not have an adequate background for evaluating therapeutic agents. What is the source of their information? Are they capable of sorting out the pertinent and statistically meaningful results of animal studies and preliminary human trials of a new drug? How can they know enough about the subtle differences in the structure of similar compounds that are being sold by rival companies? The busy practitioner grasps this weak crutch because of the difficulty of finding and evaluating medical reports scattered through a dozen journals."

Many leaders in the fields of medical research and teaching—Drs. Maxwell Finland, Walter Modell, Louis Lasagna, Harry S. Dowling, Frank L. Meineny, and others—criticized the promotion and "research" activities of the pharmaceutical industries in testimony before the Kefauver Committee. In addition, many lay publications (including Saturday Review, Life, and of course, Consumer Reports), a few physicians, and rare medical journals (the New England Journal of Medicine, for one) have spoken up, deploring the kind of "education" provided by ethical-drug promotion.

One of the most important of these statements appeared in an article by Dr. Charles D. May, "Selling Drugs by Educating Physicians," in the Journal of Medical Education for January 1961. Dr. May is an eminent pediatrician, editor of Pediatrics, the official journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics, and a professor of pediatrics at New York University Medical School. He writes:

"For the past 3 years major pharmaceutical companies have been engaged in a competitive struggle to increase the sales of their particular brands of antibiotics by a confused and misleading barrage of promotion. \* \* \* The educational effect on doctors was to confuse them and lead them to believe wonderful new [antibiotic] drugs were available and that minor differences in blood level and the rate of absorption [of these antibiotics] are significant therapeutic advantages. The untrustworthiness of educational material employed to promote basic [drug] products is not peculiar to antibiotics. Similar disregard for the available evidence and for authoritative opinion can be seen frequently."

"Reference is often made to unpublished data from 'personal communications,' 'case reports in the company's files' which are collected at random, and even individual testimonials. None of these can be readily evaluated in an acceptable fashion."

"Quotations lifted out of context are a favorite means of misusing sound sources, and inferior articles in the medical literature may be selected to support the claims even when superior work is available to refute them. Only one or two of an impressive list of references may have any pertinence to the claims being propounded."

"Most lamentable is the lack of concern for the authenticity of material in the advertising pages in medical journals, which almost outweigh the editorial text in bulk and influence. Few journals show signs of a determined effort to reject misleading advertisements."

But, Dr. May notes, "A notable effort is being made to overcome the inadequacies of education of physicians by an independent group of competent physicians who are publishing The Medical Letter." This biweekly, four-page newsletter accepts no advertising. It is edited by and has among its consultants distinguished pharmacologists and physicians in leading medical schools. The Medical Letter, published in New York City, has gained wide influence as an unbiased source of information for physicians and other health personnel on the therapeutic properties and side-effects of current drugs.

#### JUST PLAIN TOO MANY DRUGS

One of the more thorough discussions of the trouble with ethical-drug research and promotion has been contributed by Dr. Walter Modell, a distinguished pharmacologist-physician, and director of clinical pharmacology at Cornell University Medical College. In an editorial in the January-February 1961 issue of Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, of which he is editor, Dr. Modell commented as follows:

"If the pharmaceutical chemists took the time to look back at the net result of their prolificacy, would they be shocked to discover that the point of no return may have been passed? Do they suspect that now, instead of helping mankind with new drugs, they may be making matters worse?"

"Untoward reactions to medication have \* \* \* increased at a staggering rate. This comes about primarily because of lack of experience with many different and entirely new active drugs and because of inability to master the full implications of these agents as rapidly as they are marketed."

"If this was all a hazard inherent in medical progress \* \* \* there would be some justification for it, but too often this is not the case. Too often new drugs are turned loose on the public to horn in on a market which has been created by someone else's discovery, to compete with drugs which have recently been established as good and useful. Too often they are hurried into use to get in on a market before it vanishes. I know of a pharmaceutical company in possession of a series of congeners which kept what it deemed to be the best \* \* \* and licensed the inferior ones to other distributors."

"There is a manufacturer who sells one drug entity in this country and a congener in another country, making precisely the same claims in each case; namely, that each is the best for the same purpose. \* \* \* Since more than one drug cannot be the best for the same indication, we simply don't have enough diseases to go around. At the moment the most helpful contribution is the new drug to counteract the untoward effects of other new drugs; we now have several of these."

"Are physicians characteristically irrational and irresponsible? No. But they may sometimes appear to be because of the sheer impossibility of dealing rationally and responsibly with so many new drugs, about which so little is known but for which extravagant claims are made and for the use of which pressure is exerted by the drug industry and by patients who have heard of new cures through newspapers, magazines, and other patients. Vigorous drug promotion even before the drugs are available helps build up pressure to use them."

"Excessive numbers of drugs are now being introduced, excessive in view of the working capacities of those competent to test their safety and utility in man, excessive in view of the subjects available for the testing of their effects, dangers and uses in man, and excessive in view of the ability of those who



must assimilate the essential knowledge and learn how to prescribe them effectively and safely and rationally.

"It makes little difference if, under the impression that it is the best, a housewife buys the next best detergent. But you may not fool any of the people any of the time about drugs. \* \* \* If, under the misapprehension that if it is the best, a doctor prescribes \* \* \* less than the best, it may be the difference between life and death. Unlike the housewife and her detergent, it is clearly immoral if the physician is even slightly misled by claims made for the drugs he is importuned to use on the sick. \* \* \* There is the very real ethical question of whether the pharmaceutical industry has the right to sell all the drugs it creates and whether it does not have the moral obligation to select only the elite of its creations.

"Industry should \* \* \* terminate the current practice of the hurried introduction of new drugs \* \* \* to establish a foothold on the market while leaving the real testing of drugs to practicing physicians, with patients as unwitting subjects."

#### CU'S CONCLUSION

It is obvious, in CU's view, that much is wrong with the pricing, promotion, and research activities of ethical-drug companies. The consumer, even more than the physician, has a life-conserving as well as financial stake in these problems. Voluntary action by the pharmaceutical industry can help to correct abuses. But today the fact is inescapable that Government action also is needed. The problems of the overproliferation of drugs, of their uncertain safety and effectiveness, are pressing; the need for establishing better standards for evaluating drug effects is urgent. CU believes that the only real solution is more direct Federal factory supervision and certification of drugs, and the organization of special facilities for the systematic and controlled trial of new drugs. Also required are more cooperation between the FDA and State agencies, and more vigorous action by the FTC in regulating ethical-drug promotion.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE SOIL BANK ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the motion to reconsider S. 2197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2197) to amend section 107(a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

#### LET US BEGIN TO REFORM THE TAX SYSTEM

##### IMPROVED COLLECTION BY WITHHOLDING AT THE SOURCE TAXES OWED ON DIVIDENDS AND INTEREST

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in my previous speech on tax reform, I stressed the way in which many business executives are evading taxes by making excessive and improper deductions for entertainment, travel, gifts, and so forth. The Government is losing many hundreds of millions of dollars each year from these practices. This evasion makes the burden upon other taxpayers much heavier than it otherwise would be, while it breeds extravagance and loose standards of behavior throughout the community.

Today I want to deal with another great abuse. This is the failure of a large segment of our population to report income which they have received and who consequently evade their just share of taxation.

The amount of personal income which is not reported and hence, upon which taxes are not paid, is, indeed, startling. Thus, Norman Ture, the former tax expert for the Joint Economic Committee, estimated that in 1959 the total personal income which was not reported on individual tax returns amounted to no less than \$27.9 billion.<sup>1</sup> This was 8½ percent, or one-twelfth of the estimated total adjusted personal income in that year. This estimate by Mr. Ture has since been accepted by the Treasury, as shown by Secretary Dillon's testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee.<sup>2</sup>

Some of those who failed to report were, of course, those whose incomes were less than the total exemption provided under our income tax laws. The largest component of this group are the retired persons over the age of 65 who have a much greater exemption from taxation than is commonly believed.

The total amount of this exempted income has been set by the Treasury at \$3.5 billion for 1959.<sup>3</sup> This left a residual of \$24.4 billion of total income which should have been reported but which was not. The taxpayers, therefore, as a whole evaded from taxation approximately 7 percent of their adjusted personal income. The attendant loss of revenue for 1959 is estimated by the Treasury to have been \$4 billion. I believe this is a most conservative estimate and that the total may be nearer \$5 billion. Unless some effective measures are taken, this huge total is likely to increase in the future both because of the probable increase in national income and the progressive demoralization which continued flouting of the law inevitably creates.

The Secretary of the Treasury in his testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee made some informed estimates on the amounts which were evaded by the various component groups.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table from Secretary Dillon's testimony, giving the estimates of income received by certain groups of individuals but which did not appear on tax returns, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Income received by individuals during 1959 not accounted for on tax returns, by type <sup>1</sup>		Billion dollars
Total income not reported on tax returns <sup>2</sup> -----		27.9
Less: Income received by individuals not required to file returns-----		3.5

<sup>1</sup> "The Federal Revenue System" (printed for use of the Joint Economic Committee, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 1961, p. 11).

<sup>2</sup> Testimony of Secretary of the Treasury Dillon before subcommittee of Senate Appropriations Committee, 1961, p. 182.

<sup>3</sup> Testimony of Secretary Dillon, *Ibid.*, p. 182.

#### Income received by individuals during 1959 not accounted for on tax returns, by type<sup>1</sup>—Continued

	Billion dollars
Equals: Total reportable income not accounted for on tax returns-----	24.4
Dividends-----	.9
Interest-----	2.8
Annuities and pensions-----	.6
Business and farm profit-----	12.0
Wages and salaries-----	6.5
Other income <sup>2</sup> -----	1.6

<sup>1</sup> Estimates based on preliminary data.

<sup>2</sup> "The Federal Revenue System: Facts and Problems, 1961," p. 15 (publication of Joint Economic Committee).

<sup>3</sup> Unreported income from all other sources not specified such as rents, royalties, and capital gains.

Source: Research Division, Internal Revenue Service, May 4, 1961.

With respect to the revenue effects of this underreporting, we have made estimates for some of the categories but not for all. The failures to report dividend and interest incomes were estimated to have reduced revenues by \$342 and \$522 million, respectively, or a total of \$864 million at the 1959 income levels. Our studies in the other areas have not progressed far enough to make comparable estimates. One problem is that while this income should have been reported under the tax-filing requirements, not all of the income would have been taxable even if reported. For example, some of the unreported income from businesses and farms would have been on returns which would not be taxable after allowances for deductions and exemptions. As a rough overall estimate, I would say that the total revenue loss from the failure to report the \$24.4 billion was at least \$4 billion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the independent entrepreneurs, such as farmers, professional men and women, and independent businessmen, were estimated not to have declared about \$12 billion of net income. This was about a quarter, or 25 percent, of the probable total of farm, business, and professional income for 1959.<sup>1</sup> It is indeed a somber thought that the percentage of evasion amongst this group should be so high. It makes understandable some of the difficulties in collecting income taxes in countries such as France, where business is still largely conducted on an individual basis.

While the total amount of wages and salaries which were not reported and which were estimated at \$6.5 billion may seem large in absolute amounts, it should be noted that this was only 2½ percent of the total wage and salary payments in that year of \$268 billion. On a relative basis, therefore, this was a 10 times better record than the 25- to 27-percent loss in unreported income from entrepreneurial income. This is not due in my judgment to any superior virtue on the part of wage earners and salaried folk, but simply to the fact that a withholding tax of 18 percent is imposed upon their incomes. This is deducted by their employers from their pay and forwarded to the Treasury.

<sup>1</sup> See Economic Indicators, May 1961, p. 4. If we exclude the \$3½ billion of imputed income of farmers in the form of the rental value of farm homes and food grown on the farm and consumed by farm families, and take only taxable cash income, this figure would be nearer 27 percent.



The Treasury also estimates that the cost of collecting this amount by withholding would be \$18 million a year, or only 3 percent of the \$613 million which the Treasury would receive. It does not seem to me that the argument about cost is supported by the facts.

## CONCLUSION

Mr. President, some \$940 million in dividend payments and some \$2.8 billion in interest payments made yearly in the United States, and on most of which taxes are owed, are nevertheless not reported on the income tax returns of taxpayers. When every allowance is made for low-income taxpayers, we find that some \$864 million in taxes on these amounts which are owed now escape taxation and are not reported by taxpayers.

The Treasury has devised a simple method of collecting these taxes by withholding on dividends and interest at the source. As I have repeatedly said, it would require almost no paperwork by the withholding organization. It would cause very little trouble to the taxpayer. Furthermore, where overwithholding would exist, this group of taxpayers is to be given a special break over the 35 million taxpayers whose wages and salaries are now overwithheld against and they are to be given a quarterly refund if they apply on a simple form.

While every argument known to man is thrown up as an objection against withholding on these amounts, I suspect the real reason is that many among those who now receive or disburse such dividend and interest income are under the false illusion that they now owe no taxes on these amounts.

This, of course, is not true. Taxes are owed on these amounts. When \$836 million of taxes owed are evaded or avoided by these taxpayers—who as a class are among the highest income groups in the country—then others and lower income taxpayers must make up the difference in the higher taxes which they pay.

This is unfair and unjust and will lead to the decay of our tax system if it is not changed by the simple proposal which the Treasury has made.

Mr. President, the tax program of the President is obviously in trouble in the House of Representatives. If the Senate is to act on a tax bill this year, it is necessary that the bill should come over to the Senate relatively soon. The Treasury began to present its evidence on May 5. The hearings were concluded on June 9. The Committee on Ways and Means has been meeting since June 9. Almost every day press notices are issued to the effect that this feature and that feature of the President's tax pro-

gram has been either eliminated or whittled down. The House is likely to find itself faced with an extremely truncated measure.

Some of us withheld offering amendments to the tax bill which came before the Senate toward the end of June, on the premise, as I understood, that the House would send a bill to us by July 15. July 15 will occur tomorrow. There is no prospect that the bill will be out of committee by that time. After the Committee on Ways and Means has concluded its action on the bill, it will have to go before the Committee on Rules and will have to be voted on by the House. It is likely to come to the Senate in a very mangled form.

Unless the House acts quickly, and unless the Senate acts promptly thereafter, we shall likely find ourselves either legislating too late in the session or passing an extremely inadequate tax measure. I hope Senators may awaken to the seriousness of the situation, and that both within the Committee on Finance and, if necessary, on the floor of the Senate, changes may be presented in the House bill which will place in effect most of the features of the President's program and plug many of the tax loopholes which now exist and which greatly weaken the tax structure.

EXHIBIT 1.—Selected examples of substantial underreporting of dividends and/or interest in recent fraud prosecution cases

Case No.	Dividends and/or interest			Tax year	Adjusted gross income per return	Occupation of taxpayer	Case No.	Dividends and/or interest			Tax year	Adjusted gross income per return	Occupation of taxpayer
	Determined to be reportable	Reported on return	Under-reported					Determined to be reportable	Reported on return	Under-reported			
1	\$6,110	\$250	\$5,860	1954	\$1,582	Farmer.	17	\$1,778	\$325	\$1,453	1953	\$1,660	Farming.
	5,779	0	5,779	1955	1,641			1,939	350	1,589	1954	2,124	
	5,705	0	5,705	1956	1,605			2,341	365	1,976	1955	1,960	
	5,388	0	5,388	1957	1,621		18	2,347	1,119	1,229	1956	7,450	Not stated.
2	4,490	397	4,093	1954	22,432	Picture theater.	19	7,163	0	7,163	1955	16,876	Farmer.
3	1,802	871	1,091	1954	3,109	Maintenance service.		12,827	0	12,827	1956	16,239	
	1,994	837	1,157	1955	4,079		20	14,647	0	14,647	1952	(1)	Not stated.
	927	0	927	1956	4,912			14,989	0	14,989	1953	(1)	
	2,194	1,686	508	1957	8,379			15,412	0	15,412	1954	(1)	
4	3,143	0	3,143	1953	1,490	Broker-sales.		10,704	0	10,704	1955	(1)	
	5,695	0	5,695	1954	1,501			18,852	0	18,852	1956	(1)	
	6,046	0	6,046	1955	1,402			19,101	0	19,101	1957	(1)	
5	7,371	0	7,371	1953	4,366	Home builder and farmer.	21	11,718	0	11,718	1954	(1)	Do.
	10,459	0	10,459	1954	24,464			15,266	0	15,266	1955	(1)	
6	16,321	3,449	12,872	1955	19,062	Furniture store.	22	3,132	0	3,132	1955	(1)	Do.
7	7,009	3,030	3,979	1951	11,766	Attorney.		2,640	0	2,640	1956	(1)	
	5,947	3,439	2,508	1952	12,563		23	97	0	97	1953	5,800	Store manager.
	5,631	2,899	2,732	1953	(831)			0	0	1,117	1954	7,446	
	11,725	7,709	4,016	1954	20,841			0	0	1,423	1955	7,652	
8	20,785	5,183	15,602	1954	8,403	Rental property.		0	0	3,609	1956	24,659	
	45,682	9,466	36,216	1955	33,776		24	422	0	422	1953	?	Farming.
	47,689	29,046	18,643	1956	45,069			1,669	658	1,011	1954	3,923	
9	3,186	75	3,111	1954	4,249	Dentist.		2,520	792	1,728	1955	2,907	
	4,283	75	4,208	1955	4,400			2,424	1,436	988	1956	424	
	4,828	75	4,753	1956	7,720		25	2,239	0	2,239	1953	8,615	Tax assessor and movie operator.
	5,665	92	5,573	1957	8,322			2,486	0	2,486	1954	9,045	
	5,292	0	5,292	1958	10,892			3,113	0	3,113	1955	10,638	
10	1,396	0	1,396	1953	3,289	Self-employed.	26	7,504	4,976	2,528	1952	16,161	Merchandise warehousing and trading.
	1,576	0	1,576	1954	2,764			5,303	5,271	32	1953	14,409	
	1,835	0	1,835	1955	2,695			7,456	5,646	1,810	1954	15,969	
	2,400	0	2,400	1956	4,240		27	2,334	361	1,973	1954	12,212	Physician and surgeon.
11	2,377	0	2,377	1953	(863)	Cattle dealer.		2,086	611	1,475	1955	13,668	
	3,610	0	3,610	1954	4,736			3,203	2,310	893	1956	14,203	
12	12,473	6,128	6,345	1955	80,661	Executive.		3,664	2,580	1,084	1957	16,336	
	15,216	6,442	8,774	1956	79,800			3,714	2,697	1,017	1958	15,445	
	21,777	18,947	2,830	1957	96,223		28	4,550	0	4,550	1953	1,682	Retired mail carrier.
13	2,961	1,961	1,000	1953	12,438	Salesman and salesgirl.		4,654	0	4,654	1954	1,632	
	3,171	2,035	1,136	1954	12,637			6,010	0	6,010	1955	1,664	
	3,677	2,269	1,408	1955	10,400			7,308	0	7,308	1956	1,824	
14	100,457	0	100,457	1953	?	Real estate.	29	12,721	4,043	8,678	1954	8,514	Dentist.
	78,672	0	78,672	1954	9,554			12,082	6,469	5,613	1955	11,247	
	69,086	0	69,086	1955	8,558			12,877	6,892	5,985	1956	11,950	
	74,496	22,649	51,847	1956	382,043			14,902	8,390	6,512	1957	13,612	
15	3,140	0	3,140	1953	2,000	Extractor.	30	5,504	523	4,981	1953	7,863	Not stated.
	3,109	0	3,109	1954	2,117			7,128	873	6,255	1954	9,038	
	3,269	755	2,514	1955	2,945			8,453	1,023	7,430	1955	8,558	
	3,231	1,420	1,811	1956	1,557			10,262	1,523	8,739	1956	6,761	
16	28,693	0	28,693	1953	(1)	Not stated (delinquent return).	31	7,226	121	7,105	1953	3,288	Self-employed.
	26,143	0	26,143	1954	70,347			6,706	1,508	5,198	1954	7,600	

Footnote at end of table.



## EXHIBIT 1.—Selected examples of substantial underreporting of dividends and/or interest in recent fraud prosecution cases—Continued

Case No.	Dividends and/or interest			Tax year	Adjusted gross income per return	Occupation of taxpayer	Case No.	Dividends and/or interest			Tax year	Adjusted gross income per return	Occupation of taxpayer
	Determined to be reportable	Reported on return	Under-reported					Determined to be reportable	Reported on return	Under-reported			
31	\$9,811	\$164	\$9,647	1955	\$10,652	Investments.	32	\$112,950	\$91,410	\$21,540	1956	\$140,116	Printer.
	18,671	336	18,335	1956	10,762		33	5,515	2,548	2,967	1953	6,105	
	15,848	476	15,372	1957	13,610			4,903	2,023	2,880	1954	6,494	
32	117,367	89,940	27,427	1953	89,940			6,015	2,885	3,130	1955	7,845	
	113,671	93,532	20,139	1954	409,516			6,803	3,426	3,377	1956	9,100	
	66,592	60,325	6,267	1955	163,899								

<sup>1</sup> No return.

## Selected examples of substantial underreporting of interest on 1959 income tax returns

Case No.	Taxable interest			Adjusted gross income per return	Occupation of taxpayer	Case No.	Taxable interest			Adjusted gross income per return	Occupation of taxpayer
	On information documents	Reported on return <sup>1</sup>	Under-reported				On information documents	Reported on return <sup>1</sup>	Under-reported		
1	\$2,100	\$470	\$2,100	\$5,815	Renting of property.	21	\$679	0	\$679	\$10,463	Farmer.
2	774	26	774	3,972	Executive.	22	1,375	\$555	1,375	2,016	Retired.
3	657	0	657	13,201	Steel cutter.	23	1,425	706	1,425	9,720	Merchant.
4	986	0	986	14,811	Executive.	24	649	0	649	10,932	Orchardist.
5	1,680	513	1,680	8,934	Not stated.	25	729	51	729	10,283	Janitor and custodian.
6	907	0	907	7,044	Retired.	26	3,066	1,650	3,066	3,399	Cattle.
7	992	94	992	2,581	Farmer.	27	682	0	682	6,658	Farmer.
8	801	0	801	4,058	Do.	28	2,562	0	2,562	10,839	Real estate and insurance agent.
9	606	0	606	7,201	Not stated.	29	678	0	678	7,843	Farmer (retired).
10	8,000	3,790	8,000	15,105	Student.	30	792	0	792	10,066	Merchant.
11	32,570	27	32,570	62,617	Lawyer.	31	1,364	858	506	4,036	Dairyman.
12	8,400	706	8,400	21,713	Not stated.	32	780	0	780	24,780	District manager.
13	1,800	495	1,305	4,952	Do.	33	1,182	0	1,182	1,940	Not stated.
14	650	0	650	6,224	Do.	34	3,250	0	3,250	25,615	Real estate broker.
15	738	0	738	8,688	Switchboard operator.	35	6,152	3,948	3,064	32,574	Hotel executive.
16	719	0	719	10,212	Corporation officer.	36	2,839	0	2,839	23,691	Farming.
17	607	0	607	1,185	Not stated.	37	765	0	765	4,059	Packing plant.
18	1,157	133	1,157	3,617	Teacher.	38	1,273	0	1,273	8,996	Insurance clerk.
19	2,344	1,152	2,344	11,141	Housewife.						
20	1,001	0	1,001	4,336	Not stated.						

<sup>1</sup> Unreported interest is the amount reported on information returns but not reported on the return. The interest reported on the return may cover amounts not covered by information documents, especially in the case of joint returns where

documents for only 1 spouse were available. As a result, the "underreported" amount may not equal the difference between the document and the return amounts.

## Selected examples of substantial underreporting of dividends on 1959 income tax returns

Case No.	Taxable dividends			Adjusted gross income per return	Occupation of taxpayer	Case No.	Taxable dividends			Adjusted gross income per return	Occupation of taxpayer
	On information documents	Reported on return <sup>1</sup>	Under-reported				On information documents	Reported on return <sup>1</sup>	Under-reported		
1	\$871	\$231	\$640	\$7,866	Mechanic.	11	\$405	0	\$405	\$4,335	Not stated.
2	1,470	572	898	2,016	Factory worker.	12	918	\$519	467	716	Clerk.
3	1,361	421	940	4,182	Clerk.	13	5,546	3,020	3,253	12,970	Not stated.
4	344	0	344	11,804	Do.	14	2,448	408	2,040	40,895	Geologist.
5	343	0	343	3,971	Collector.	15	6,814	1,796	6,147	2,435	Not stated.
6	2,087	1,125	1,152	5,715	Barber.	16	12,573	0	12,573	11,222	Lawyer.
7	1,711	22,172	1,711	43,561	Not stated.	17	2,661	3,005	702	19,089	Housewife.
8	590	0	590	5,035	Clerk.	18	1,937	2,656	726	25,880	Not stated.
9	558	241	453	4,467	Dressmaker.	19	324	0	324	28,963	Real estate broker.
10	3,214	3,676	2,900	34,728	Certified public accountant.	20	6,657	5,479	1,865	6,821	Not stated.
						21	761	425	336	4,120	Laborer.

<sup>1</sup> Unreported dividends are the amounts reported on information returns but not reported on the return. The dividends reported on the return may cover amounts not covered by information documents, especially in the case of joint returns where

documents for only 1 spouse were available. As a result, the "underreported" amount may not equal the difference between the document and the return amounts.

## FEED DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, according to my understanding, the parliamentary situation is that the Senate is now considering the motion for the reconsideration of the vote by which Senate bill 2197 was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 2197, to amend section 107(a)(3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, was passed. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider has been agreed to; and Senate bill 2197 is now before the Senate for further consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this bill was reported on last Wednesday from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. On the same day it was brought before the Senate, for consideration—largely on my own responsibility. I thought I had checked with all Senators concerned, but I did not quite cover the entire field. The result was that reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed was requested; and that request was made within the rights of

Senators and the rules, and procedures of the Senate, because no report on the bill was available for general distribution at the time when the bill was brought up in the Senate; and extremely quick action was taken on the bill, which had been reported unanimously, that day, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

It is my hope that on the basis of the action taken a moment ago by the Senate on the motion to reconsider, with the result that the bill is now before the Senate, we shall be able to bring about a nailing down in regard to exactly the intent of the bill, because enactment of



the bill is vitally needed for the benefit of the northern Great Plains States, in the area extending from Montana, east of the Continental Divide, I believe, all the way into Wisconsin.

The bill has been sponsored by the distinguished Senators from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT and Mr. CASE], the distinguished Senators from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. McCARTHY], the distinguished Senators from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG and Mr. BURDICK], the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and by my colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and myself.

So I express the hope that after the exact effect of the bill is made clear, the bill will promptly be passed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in support of what the majority leader has said, let me state, for the benefit of my good friend, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], that earlier in the week the majority leader had announced to the Senate that as soon as the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the bill, it would seek to have the bill brought up for immediate action by the Senate; and when I brought up the bill and motioned it out of committee on the day when it was reported to the Senate, I stated that the majority leader had made that announcement. As a matter of fact on a previous occasion the vote on the bill was reconsidered, and the bill was returned to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because of some confusion of language which had to be straightened out.

Although it is true that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is exactly within his rights, because there was no opportunity to have the report on the bill printed and circulated in the normal fashion, yet it is important to note that in this instance we are dealing with a measure to provide relief in an emergency situation, and we are trying to fight the disaster of draught with all the tools available, plus the fact that the concept of this bill is four square with what Congress has done previously, in similar circumstances, in years gone by.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from South Dakota that in an attempt to "touch all the bases," I did contact the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], who reported the bill, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the distinguished majority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], and all other Senators I could think of in connection with the bill. But I did miss contacting the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I must apologize for that.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Delaware formerly was a distinguished member of our committee; and if he were still a member of it, he would certainly have been notified. We hated to have him leave the committee, even though frequently we disagreed with his counsel.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Furthermore, the Senator from Delaware has stated many

times his belief—and he was quite correct, I think—that the reports on bills should be on the desks of Senators when Senate consideration of the bills is requested.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I regretted the necessity of filing the motion requesting reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed. I realize the threat of disaster which faces the people of the area affected, and I realize the necessity for taking prompt action. I informed the majority leader that I would cooperate with him in that regard. I was only requesting an opportunity to check on certain features of the bill.

As I said in the beginning, I am in wholehearted agreement with the objective of the bill, which is to assist those in the affected area who, through no fault of their own but solely as a result of the drought, are threatened with disaster unless some action is taken.

But I wish to make sure that the bill will not be susceptible to abuse. In that connection, I refer to abuse such as that which developed a few years ago under a similar plan which was developed for the relief of those in the Southwest. As members of the committee so well remember, at that time we found, for example, that the famous King Ranch was obtaining relief under that drought-relief program, although certainly it was never intended that the King Ranch should have been eligible. That ranch covers an area larger than the total area of my own State, and certainly the owner of that much land does not need public relief.

In another situation we found that the owner of a racehorse was obtaining relief under that act, at the same time that his horse was winning the Belmont Stakes. I venture to say that that was the first time in the history of the United States that a racehorse winning the Belmont Stakes won it for the benefit of an owner who was on relief. I know of no Member of Congress who intended that to happen. Nevertheless, it did happen.

That is why I wish to make sure that when we enact this bill to provide needed drought relief—which we wish to provide—the bill be in such form that the relief provided there under will go to those farmers in the area who need it, not to those who do not need it.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. In order to make perfectly clear the legislative record on this matter, let me say that I certainly agree with the Senator from Delaware that any person who does not need such assistance should not receive it. Certainly the owners of racehorses should not be on Government relief. However, I may say to the Senator from Delaware that the action in that instance was an administrative rather than a legislative matter.

In order to make perfectly clear the intent of this measure, I wish to read, as part of the legislative history of the bill, a portion of the committee report, as follows:

Such feed relief could be made only to farmers in financial need of such assistance.

Those words are to be found in the next to the last paragraph on page 1 of the committee report. The paragraph is identified by the numeral "(4)."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree as to that; and the Senator from Georgia was entirely correct when he said the difficulty in the case to which I referred was largely the result of loose administrative action. But the Government was not able to collect a refund on its claims once the payments were made—at least, I do not know of any instance in which the Government was able to collect on any of its claims.

The Senator from South Dakota stated that Senate bill 2197 will merely extend existing law. Perhaps he is correct, but—

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, let me point out that I did not make such a statement. I said this bill is four square with the concept of measures of this sort which the Congress previously has passed.

Let me point out that the committee amendment on page 3 of the bill, in lines 7 through 11, includes the following:

Such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned by them.

In that connection, Mr. President, I emphasize the word "hardship." I do not think anyone could find, under any circumstances in the world, that it was a hardship for the King Ranch to buy feed for animals owned by it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate what the Senator from South Dakota has said. But in the first part of section 3 of the bill we find this language:

Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by \* \* \* adding to such sentence the following—

And on page 3 of the committee report, in the third paragraph, we find the following:

The proposed amendment would permit more expeditious relief under section 407 since assistance would not be confined to major disaster areas as determined under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and would permit the Secretary to make CCC stocks of feed grain available under such terms and conditions as are most fitting to the existing emergency.

This later quote is from a letter written by the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, and I understand that section was adopted as a part of the bill.

If section 407 has been modified to, confer upon the Secretary authority to determine what is a distressed area then I am correct in my understanding that the bill is being broadened.

Mr. TALMADGE. We have not changed in any degree the authority of the local officials, or ultimately the President of the United States, to determine a disaster area; but, in order to cover in detail finally, and I hope fully, what the Senator has raised in his question, as to who are authorized and qualified to get the feed, I call attention to



page 3 of the bill itself, line 7, and I read beginning after the comma:

Such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned by them.

I assume the Senator is fully familiar with the reasons for the legislation. Vast sections of our country are having droughts of very serious proportions. In fact, the situation has become so serious that many farmers have already begun liquidation of their foundation herds. This already has depressed the price of livestock some 4 cents a pound, and it will be lowered further if liquidation continues. In addition, farmers will be deprived of their means of livelihood if they are forced to liquidate their herds.

Most of the Nation's \$9-billion-plus agricultural surplus is in grain. We have been giving it away to other countries which have used it for various purposes. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry felt that it would be a grave injustice to drive farmers out of business in the United States of America while the taxpayers are bearing the costs of storage charges for surplus grain and such grain is being given away overseas.

This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to sell to distressed farmers who cannot get feed through normal channels the grain they need at 75 percent of the current support price. The bill enables the Secretary, under certain conditions, to permit grazing on lands in conservation reserve contiguous to drought areas. It also permits the cutting of hay from such lands under certain conditions.

In general, this is a bill to deal with a hardship situation—to help farmers who are victims of nature and do not have feed to sustain their livestock herds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I find myself in complete agreement with that objective. I am not quarreling with the objective which the Senator from Georgia and the committee are trying to achieve. It may well be that the bill is drafted in such a form that it will restrict itself to that objective alone, but I want to be sure. I think we should do something to assist farmers in keeping their basic herds, but I do not see anything in this language which would prevent, we will say, a man who has a feeder lot from receiving these same benefits. He may be suffering financial hardship, too. A lot of them are in financial hardship as feeders of cattle purely as the result of market conditions whether they are in a drought area or not. Many feeders were going to buy feed, regardless of whether there was a drought or not. Perhaps he never intended to produce his own feed.

We should do something to safeguard and protect farmers who are trying to maintain their basic herds, but I am afraid the bill is not drafted in such language as would confine it to them.

Is there anything in the bill which would prevent a feeder, a man who has say 100 steers in the feed lot and who was going to buy all of his feed anyway,

from participating under the benefits of this cheap feed? If so, then he will have a competitive advantage over his neighbor who lives just across the line of the declared area.

Mr. TALMADGE. This bill is designed to give relief to farmers adversely affected by the drought. The cattle feeder would not be involved in the situation at all. If he is a feeder he is not a farmer, and this bill is designed for farmers affected by the drought, not for cattle feeders, in or out of drought areas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would the Senator have any objection to amending the bill specifically spelling out that point? Or can we be assured that the present language so provides?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am not the author of the bill. I merely reported it from the committee. I see no objection to it if the language is designed in such form as to provide that where one is engaged in feeding, or feeding only, these provisions do not apply. There may be some situations where a person will be operating a pasture and feeding at the same time, where the provisions of the bill will be applicable to him with respect to his pasture and not be applicable to him with respect to his feeding operations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am speaking particularly of section 3.

Mr. TALMADGE. I certainly think the Secretary and his subordinates would not be carrying out the spirit of the act if they implemented it in any way to help those engaged solely in the business of feeding cattle. The purpose of the bill obviously is to help a farmer who has a pasture which has dried up and who has no feed for his cattle. The bill is designed to save the foundation herds of such farmers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If we can get the bill in a form to carry out that objective, not only will I withdraw any opposition to it but I will also wholeheartedly support it. All I want to do is make sure we are doing only that which is intended, rather than opening it up for abuse.

One suggestion I made to some Members would go far in trying to eliminate abuses. A lot of the problems are administrative ones. I recognize that fact. But if we could incorporate a provision in section 3—and I am not speaking of the other two sections because this would not be applicable to them—in which we could require some percentage of State participation in the cost, then we would be sure we were going to have local supervision over the operation of the law.

In the past I have suggested 25 percent State participation. I am not arguing for that specific figure of 25 percent. It is not the percentage that counts. Perhaps the States could put up 10 percent. If we had some sort of local and State participation, public opinion would see to it that the relief was granted only where it was needed. I wonder if the sponsors of the bill would be willing to approach the problem in that way.

I am in complete agreement with the objective stated by the Senator. I just

want to be sure we do not open the program up to abuse.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield. Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the Senator will not press that point. What he has said has merit, but may I point out that Montana was one of two States which were not prepared, legislatively, to make the necessary appropriation when most of our State was declared a drought disaster area.

Furthermore, if the Senator pursues this particular proposal, it would mean that in practically every State in the northern Great Plains a special session of their legislatures would be necessary, which in turn would be quite expensive and might not be able to accomplish what the Senator has in mind.

I express the hope, most respectfully, that the Senator will give this serious consideration before he pushes it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was speaking only with reference to amending section 3. We could make it applicable only to section 3 of the bill. The other two sections would go into effect immediately. The other two sections are the sections which were in the bill as originally introduced. Section 3 primarily is a committee amendment which was put on as a last minute proposal.

While I realize that such action may necessitate having special sessions of the legislatures of the States, nevertheless, as one who has advanced this proposal on at least a dozen different occasions in the past 5 or 6 years, I must say it has been passed over, as the Senator from Montana well knows, each time on the basis that "The legislatures are in adjournment now; let us do it later." We never get around to doing it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I wish to state we really are in a most terrible emergency situation at the present time due not only to the drought but also to the grasshoppers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I realize that. As I say, this would not affect the other two sections of the bill. Those deal with the use of the soil bank and with the hay. This proposal would not affect those sections. It would not affect anything except section 3, which was added to the bill in committee.

I am not threatening to push the proposal at this time. I realize that we are dealing with something very important to the people in the drought and disaster area and that it is necessary for the Congress to take action promptly. I am not trying to delay action. If we can work out some language which will give adequate protection I am willing to go along with it, even though I personally feel that State participation is the ultimate answer to the problem. I am not threatening to delay the bill if it does not require some sort of State participation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the constructive attitude which the Senator from Delaware uses in his ap-



proach to the problem. The Senator has very properly brought to the attention of the Senate and of the country some abuses in regard to prior relief programs. None of us wish to see those abuses repeated.

My personal interest rests primarily with the early part of the amendment itself, relating to hay and the grazing on the soil bank acres in counties which may be adjacent to or nearby the disaster area. The relief has to come there, so far as hay is concerned, because in the true disaster counties there is no hay.

Addressing myself to the particular problem the Senator from Delaware has raised, as it relates to section 3 of the amendment, section 407 of the basic act, and to this particular language quoted, it seems to me there is a possible interpretation we could use, which we could establish in the debate before the Senate, to meet the problem the Senator has in mind.

I invite attention to the fact that the last clause of the amendment proposed for the act says, "feed for livestock owned by them." I purposely emphasize the word "owned."

A livestock feeder buys stock. In his operation he is buying and turning over the stock. What we are seeking to do is to provide for the preservation of foundation herds for livestock which is owned or livestock which is raised by the man. We are not seeking to make provision for the man who is a commercial feeder, who is in the business of buying cattle and turning them over. We are seeking to provide for the preservation of the foundation herds.

A county agency told me the other day he thought that in his county and in the two counties adjacent thereto 65 to 75 percent of the cattle were moving out or being sold now. Obviously that will impair the earning ability of those farmers—it will do so for 2 or 3 years, even if they are good years—before the farmers can get back on their feet.

It does not seem to me that the man who is in the business of buying and selling cattle should rebuy at a distress feed figure. If a man is in that business, he expects to buy feed at the commercial rate. That is a commercial operation. If a proper interpretation is put upon the word "owned," it seems to me there is a limitation in the language itself. This is a program to make feed available to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned by them.

That would make it possible for a feeder to take care of the livestock he has on hand. I doubt that the language should be construed to permit a feeder to feed cattle out and then go to the market and buy more cattle to feed at 75 percent of the normal cost of feed.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. TALMADGE, and Mr. BURDICK addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield to the Senators in a moment.

I know the Senator from South Dakota, as is true of other Senators, has the

same objective I have. I am confident we can work out something, whether it is in amending the language or in strengthening the legislative intent. I repeat, I am not in any way trying to block the objectives of the bill, but I am determined to have it protected against abuse.

Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I agree completely with the objectives of the Senator from Delaware to prevent misuse of the program. If the amendment were approved requiring that the States contribute part of the money for the program, two or three problems would arise. One of them, of course, is the problem with respect to time required for the legislatures of the States to meet and enact the necessary programs. A long delay would result. There would be still more hardship for these farmers, and still more liquidation of herds.

I think there also would be a problem in regard to any program requiring matching funds from the States. If such a program were to be enacted, it should not apply just to farmers. I think, when there is matching by States, we should include all of the programs. It would be a bit difficult to write legislation of that kind hurriedly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that it should cover all of them, but I do not think it would be too much of a problem to get the proper language because the proposal has passed the House of Representatives on one occasion and it has been before the Senate committee when both the Senator and I were members of the committee. In fact, I think we have the language already drafted.

I recognize the desire for prompt action on this bill. If we can work out a solution in some other manner I am not going to push that particular proposal for State participation at this time even though I do think it should be the ultimate objective.

At the same time, I am a little bit concerned about this particular language. Perhaps we can provide some modification of the language, or perhaps we can let section 3 go over to a later date, until we have it more properly drafted. Anyway, the first two sections of the bill are not in any way affected by what I am proposing now.

Mr. TALMADGE and Mr. BURDICK addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia, who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. TALMADGE. I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Delaware in not insisting that States in the drought area call special sessions of their legislatures to pass enabling legislation and raise matching funds.

As the Senator knows, we are dealing with a disaster situation. The problem is critical and time is of the essence. Anything which requires joint participation by the Federal Government and the respective States would require a great deal of time.

I think the legislative history has been made quite clear on this matter. Every

Senator who has made comments on the problem has been of the opinion that the program is designed solely and simply for the purpose of helping farmers who, because of the drought which has adversely affected their pastures, do not have adequate feed to maintain their foundation herds. It applies in no way to the cattle feeders. It is not designed to assist those who are engaged solely in the cattle-feeding business.

As the Senator knows, a great many farmers in the area produce calves and feed those calves after they have been weaned. They are engaged in the production as well as the feeding of calves. When one tries to delineate as between those who are farmers and those who are feeders there is often a hybrid situation, and sometimes the names apply to both groups.

I do not know how an amendment could be drafted which would specifically exclude feeders and at the same time not exclude farmers.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator from Delaware has the floor. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I shall yield at this time to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I was trying to suggest that there is a delineation in the language, in the use of the word "owned." A feeder is in the business of buying. I do not think anybody would suggest that we wish to encourage speculation in the feeding of cattle by encouraging somebody to buy cattle for the purpose of taking advantage of a 75-percent rate on feed. If the cattle are owned at the time of enactment of the legislation or at the time the disaster area is declared to exist, then when the disaster strikes it seems to me to be logical for those persons to receive the benefits of the act.

Mr. TALMADGE. I believe the Senator is entirely correct. I do not think he could go out and purchase cattle at the present time and come under the provisions of the act. A farmer could not purchase cattle after the passage of this act and then feed them under the provisions of it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. In reading the language contained on page 5 of the report, I cannot see how that reasoning and conclusion can possibly be reached.

Mr. TALMADGE. I agree fully with the Senator.

Mr. HRUSKA. Obviously from this language there is no requirement that the cattle be owned in order to be eligible for the feed at 75 percent of the price.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator suggest that farmers would go out and speculate with the intention of taking advantage of the 75-percent price?

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes; I think such farmers would be eligible under the proposed language. I will tell the Senator



why. There is no time limitation under the amendment. The catastrophe to which the amendment would apply has not arisen, and we can only speculate as to whether it will arise next fall. If it does. And if an emergency is then declared, the cattle will not be owned at this time. There is nothing in the language of the bill that provides the cattle must not be newly purchased cattle. Then when farmers apply for feed at 75 percent price and assert that they own the cattle, they can have the feed under the terms of the proposed legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator will read further in the basic act, he will see there is a limitation. This is the part of the sentence to which I am referring:

\* \* \* Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Corporation, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem in the public interest, shall make available any farm commodity or product thereof owned or controlled by it for use in relieving distress (1) in any area in the United States declared by the President to be an acute distress area because of unemployment or other economic cause if the President finds that such use will not displace or interfere with normal marketing of agricultural commodities and (2) in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855) and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available \* \* \*.

It would have to be in a distressed area, and so declared.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is right, but there is nothing in the bill that provides that any farmer must limit his application for feed to cattle on hand at the time the emergency is declared. There is no limitation whatsoever.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I examined the application blanks last year, when we had similar legislation before us. I discussed this problem with the people in the Accounting Office. They told me that the application blank that they used last year does not permit one to go out and buy cattle. An applicant must testify that he owns the cattle. The farmer must get the feed within a certain period of time, and the application blank does not contemplate at all that one could go out and buy cattle for this purpose. The application blank that the farmer must sign does not permit him to go out and buy cattle in order to speculate on the purchase of feed at a discount price.

Mr. HRUSKA. The statement of the Senator is not at variance with what the Senator from Nebraska has said. All I have stated is that, within the language of the statute, such action can be taken. If there is a provision in the application or the regulations on that subject, that is another question.

I believe the Senator from Georgia has put his finger on the problem. There is enough legislative history being made here that the Secretary of Agriculture could incorporate some of the sense of this debate in his application so there will be a limitation in the application. Then the applicant could be failed out in the original instance, but he would be prevented from repeating the investment.

Mr. TALMADGE. When we enact legislation we must assume that it will be administered by an official of the Government who is not a fool or a knave.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is a great assumption at times, but I am sure we are in accord.

Mr. TALMADGE. I do not see how we can presume that the present Secretary of Agriculture will act either a fool or a knave. He knows that the purpose of the proposed legislation is to alleviate drought conditions in a disaster area.

I call to the attention of the Senator line 2, page 3, which provides, "For assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, severe hurricane, earthquake."

The Senator knows, coming from the great State of Nebraska, that the preservation and maintenance of livestock does not mean feeding them for sale. It means keeping them from starving. That is what the bill is designed to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the objectives of what is being said here. But I point out that if we pass the bill, as it is presently drafted, section 3 would be permanent legislation. Section 3 deals not only with the drought in the area which we are discussing here today but with all future situations. If I am in error in this statement I hope I will be corrected. Is there any expiration date on section 3?

Mr. TALMADGE. There is no expiration date on section 3. There is an expiration date on the other two portions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the point.

Mr. TALMADGE. Section 3 is permanent legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Section 3 is permanent legislation. Section 3 as permanent legislation is a liberalization of the existing law as provided in section 407, because under the existing law, in section 407 Congress defined what would be a disaster area. Now that definition has been expanded wherein we would confer upon the Secretary of the Agriculture the power to determine that an emergency exists in some area which warrants such assistance.

As I understand the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, or whoever may succeed him in the years to come, can under section 3 determine that an emergency exists in any area of the country and start delivering cheaper feed out at 75 percent of its cost. If I am in error on that point, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, does the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Before an area is declared by the President to be a disaster area, the Governor of the State must make a request and if the Senator will read—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator will yield for a moment, I should like to ask him if he can think of a situation in which the Governor of a State, when the State would not have to pay

anything or contribute to the cost, would refuse to make such a request?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; I have seen a reluctance on the part of Governors to have their States declared a disaster area.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have, too, in cases where it would cost them something.

Mr. TALMADGE. They are not anxious to have such an appellation ascribed to any of the counties in their States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We have not had section 3 heretofore.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Secretary's hands are not free. The President must make a finding of disaster before the Secretary can act. The provision would cover only any area of the United States declared by the President to be an acute distressed or major disaster area in need of assistance. The Secretary of Agriculture would not have a free hand.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will continue to read from section 3:

or other catastrophe in such area, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance.

The proposed legislation states that the President can take the action, and if he does not do so, as I see it, under section 3, the Secretary could. If we do not want the Secretary to take such action then let us strike that language out and return it to the original provisions of the law, under which the President alone would take the action.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I believe that the legislative history is quite clear on this point, but to make it crystal clear, I would suggest that at the end of section 3, section 407, after the word "them," to insert a comma and to add,

*Provided, however, this section shall not apply to commercial feeding.*

Would such language take care of the objection of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What definition would the Senator from North Dakota give to the words "commercial feeding"?

Mr. TALMADGE. We cannot make it descriptive, because it would be impossible to define a commercial feeder.

The provision which reads:

Shall not be available to cattle purchased in the disaster area subsequent to a declaration of a disaster.

would prevent a man from going out and buying up cattle in order to get the available feed. I do not think the language of the act makes it crystal clear that there can be no speculation on other farmers' hardship.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, but it would be attractive on the eve of a declaration of the area as a disaster area to buy cheaper cattle and to feed them out. It has been suggested that this is an effort to preserve the basic foundation herd. Could we not just put that language in the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What would be considered a foundation herd?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let us hear what the Senator suggests by way of language.



Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On line 3, page 3, I suggest, immediately before the word "livestock" the insertion of "foundation herd."

Mr. HUMPHREY. What would be the interpretation of a foundation herd?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would be stock raised by the owner.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One could have a pasture full of steers, which would not be related to the foundation herd.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. That is the trouble. There could be a pasture full of steers, and in the majority of situations like that the owners would be buying feed anyway, even in the midst of plenty. Does the Senator intend to allow those who are in that area to feed the steers at 25 percent less in cost than the man on the other side of the county line which was not a distressed area?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the underlying reasons for the introduction of the bill is to permit what we are talking about. There are farmers in the Great Plains States who are preserving their foundation herds at great expense to themselves and at great sacrifice, having sold off much of the cattle that they had bought possibly on credit, and selling them at market conditions that are not conducive to a fair return. If we are not to provide emergency relief for the people in those States who are suffering through no fault of their own, there is no need to provide anything. If we continue to talk long enough about this situation, there will be no need to worry about it, because there will be no cattle left.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The bill could have been brought up last week. We were here last week, and we did no business for 3 days. We had a vacation, although we had been called back by the leadership because we are told that we would transact business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It takes time to process a bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was here. Some of the Senators who are speaking today were not present. I do not believe I should be criticized and told that I am holding up the bill merely because I am trying to prevent it from being abused.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota introduced the bill. The committee processed the bill. The bill was passed in the Senate. The only Senator who objected to it was the Senator from Delaware. He has the responsibility.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. All I asked was for an opportunity to read the bill. I have a right to read the bill. Perhaps if the Senator from Minnesota had not been out of the country we could have considered it sooner. I am not being unreasonable in asking for an opportunity to read a bill which was passed by the Senate even before it was printed and put on the calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is entitled to do that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator should not say that I am un-

reasonably delaying the bill. I have tried to be cooperative. I just want to make sure that it is drafted in language which will prevent it from being abused. I am willing to have it amended to provide for foundation herds.

Mr. TALMADGE. Would the Senator agree to providing for foundation herds and steers at present on hand?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No.

Mr. TALMADGE. Why not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If we start subsidizing the feeding of steers in the feedlots then the program is in trouble. Most of the steers in feedlots will be fed on purchased feed anyway.

Mr. TALMADGE. If the herd is already in the feedlot, it is not necessary to have pasture.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. Then it is already a commercial herd, and I do not believe it would be eligible under the terms of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It should not be. Then why does the Senator object to having it specifically excluded?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Why does not the Senator from Delaware accept the language suggested by the Senator from North Dakota, to exclude commercial feed, and indicate that that is what we are talking about—namely, the foundation herd and steers in pasture that were acquired prior to the area being in a disaster condition?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The proposal of the Senator from Minnesota and his colleagues, the Senators from South Dakota and North Dakota and Montana and other States, comprised sections 1 and 2 at the time of the introduction. If I am in error, I hope I will be corrected, but I believe section 3 was incorporated afterward as a result of a conversation we had with people in Montana who were up against very stiff prices in the purchase of feed grain to take care of their cattle.

Mr. METCALF. The incorporation of section 3 came about as a result of conversations we had with the ACP chairmen of Montana, who had had similar conversations with chairmen in the Dakotas and other drought areas. It was pointed out that as a result of going into a new marketing year the price of such feed grains as barley had gone up 25 percent, while the price of beef, because of selling in a disaster market, had fallen by about the same amount.

So the majority leader and I asked that the amendment be incorporated into the bill to take care of the unusual circumstances occasioned by the application of a new marketing year to the feed-grain bill, and to provide that the Federal Government could sell, at the price during the last marketing year, the barley that was in storage, which had been purchased for a lesser amount and was in warehouses and storage bins.

That is the history of why we asked for section 3.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, that should not preclude, the Senator from Delaware exercising his rights. The bill was brought out in a hurry. He is perfectly within the rights in what he is doing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So far as sections 1 and 2 are concerned, I am not raising any question about them. I am not quarreling with what I believe is sought to be achieved in section 3. I merely wish to be sure that we do not open the situation wide. I am wondering if in section 3 perhaps we can redefine the word "livestock" in some way to provide for a termination date with respect to section 3. We are writing permanent legislation here. I wonder why it was suggested that we give authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine when an emergency may exist. Why not leave the determination as provided under existing law?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that we might be able to adjudicate the issue by a very simple device. What we are trying to do is to meet an emergency which now exists in a certain area of the country. The Senator from Delaware made the point that there is perhaps some ambiguity in section 3. By a very careful study we might be able to define what we are trying to do. I suggest that we put the whole bill on the same basis, of temporary legislation. Let section 3 expire on June 30, 1962, along with the rest of the bill. That would give the committee an opportunity to analyze it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that would be perfectly satisfactory, because the committee could consider the problem in the meantime. What we should provide for now is the emergency.

Mr. MUNDT. With this legislative history now being written, the Secretary of Agriculture will move cautiously, because we must come back on January 1 to seek a renewal of the legislation. So I suggest that we let it all expire in June 1962. If we start to amend definitions on the floor of the Senate, the result will be a worse bill than the one now before us.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Notwithstanding the fear that my colleague has just expressed, I venture to offer some language which I think would be practical and useful in connection with the word "livestock."

The junior Senator from South Dakota does not hesitate to say that he is in the livestock business. However, I shall not take advantage of the proposed legislation. I expect to buy on the open market whatever feed I have to buy. So I venture to make a suggestion which occurs to me, notwithstanding the fact that I am in the business of producing feeder cattle today. After the word "livestock," I propose to insert these words:

Produced by the owner or owned by him at the time the area was declared to be in distress.

This would prevent speculation. It would provide a definition for a founda-



tion herd, without going into that question. A man who owns cattle at a time an area is declared to be in distress, either cattle which he has bought or cattle which have been raised by him, obviously did not get the cattle with the idea of encountering a distress period. The cattle must be owned by him or have been produced by him at the time the area was declared to be in distress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The suggestions made by both Senators from South Dakota will go far toward solving the problem. I wonder if we cannot go one step further. Is it really necessary to grant the Secretary the power to be determined by the President after the Governors have made recommendations? tion, under which emergencies are determined by the President after the Governors have made recommendations?

Mr. HRUSKA. After reading the bill which was passed, and appears on page 5 of the report and after referring to Public Law 875 of the 81st Congress, which I have before me, I am confident that the requirement that the Governor shall certify an area as a distressed area and that the President shall then so declare it, is still inherent in the bill. Is there anything in the bill to the contrary?

Mr. TALMADGE. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We can make it clear that this is our thinking concerning the proposal and that will take care of the situation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What the Senator from Nebraska has said is true. If Senators will read the first part of the bill we have been talking about, they will find that it is first necessary for the President to have found an acute distress area and to have determined that a disaster exists. It is only in the areas in which the President has found distress to exist that the Secretary may then enter into the picture. This language does not empower the Secretary to go out and determine de novo that the areas is in distress. He is limited in his designation of areas to those which the President has previously determined to be distressed areas.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, has any thought been given to the last part of section 3, which reads, in part, "such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned by them?"

I emphasize the phrase "without undue financial hardship."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from North Dakota. I know that that is what we have in mind. I think language which would, perhaps, carry out the intent can be developed in a few minutes. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, after consultation between Senators from the areas which are most vitally affected and the Senator from Delaware, I believe agreement has been reached upon language which will accomplish the objective of the proposed legislation while at the same time, alleviating the fears of the Senator from Delaware and others that there might be some abuses under the program. If the Senator from Delaware is prepared to submit his amendment, I think agreement can be reached.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On page 3, line 6, I propose to strike the word "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "the President, pursuant to Public Law 875, 81st Congress". The language would then read: "\* \* \* the President, pursuant to Public Law 875, 81st Congress, determines that an emergency exists."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. TALMADGE. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The purpose of the amendment is to restore the existing law, which provides that only the President may determine a distressed area.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct. The language would make certain that the responsibility is upon the President, not the Secretary of Agriculture, to determine what are disaster areas upon the request of the Governors of the affected States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. President, at the end of section 3, after line 11 on page 3, I propose that the bill be amended to provide the same expiration date as is provided in the other sections of the bill, namely, June 30, 1962.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, is it the intention of the committee or of the Senator from Delaware to apply the time limitation to only the 75 percent of support price provision? There is a permanent statute in effect which we would not want to limit the date of June 30, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; but, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has said, this proposal would give the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry time in which to reconsider the problem. In the meantime, provision would be made for the emergency.

I suggest the following language at the conclusion of the bill, page 3, line 11:

*Provided*, That the authority herein provided shall expire June 30, 1962.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The members of the staff have just suggested language which would accomplish the purpose better. After line 11, it is proposed to add a new section, section 4, which would read as follows:

The amendments made by this Act shall be effective only until June 30, 1962.

That will take care of all changes which are being made in the bill, and the expiration date for all of them will be as of June 30, 1962.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the amendment is agreed to. Are there further amendments?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, with these two amendments and with the understanding and the legislative record being made that the purpose of the bill is to help financially distressed farmers to preserve their foundation herds alone and not to subsidize commercial feeding in feeder lots, I have no further objection. I understand now that the bill offers no subsidy to those who would normally have been buying grain regardless of whether a drought had occurred or not, I think the purpose of this measure is now clear. The purpose of this measure is not to provide relief for farmers who would have had to purchase feed for their feeder cattle anyway regardless of drought conditions.

With that legislative record established, I have no objection to passage of the bill.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. First, let me say that I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Delaware. At the present time, I serve with him on the Finance Committee. Formerly, he served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I still have the honor to serve. He is a very able, conscientious, and valuable Senator.

What we are trying to do through this bill is to be almost as good to farmers in our own drought-disaster area as we are to foreign countries to which our Government is selling our surplus grain for foreign currencies which cannot be exchanged for any other currency which our Government subsequently gives back.

This measure is designed simply to alleviate the distress and hardship which exist in drought-disaster areas where farmers do not have grass on which their cattle can graze. Those farmers are faced with the necessity of either liquidating their herds or seeing their cattle starve to death. This bill is to help them and no others.

I think the amendments the able Senator from Delaware has submitted have closed any loopholes through which any thieves could evade or abuse this law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, in line 3, after the word "livestock," it is proposed to insert "produced by the owner or owned by him at the time the area was declared to be in distress."



Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have examined the amendment. I wonder whether it will open up the bill to such an extent that the owner of 1,000 steers, who had them in the feedlots and owned them on that date, would be able to be benefited. Would not this amendment open the bill wider than anyone intends?

I think we now have the bill fairly well tied down; and I wish to be sure that we do not open it up again. But the words "produced by the owner or owned by him" might include a man who had 1,000 head of steers in the feedlots. He was not planning to feed them with grain produced on his farm, anyway, but was going to buy the feed. Would not he be able to qualify for a subsidy under this amendment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My personal knowledge of the disaster-stricken counties is that in them there are practically no cattle feeders of the sort the Senator has mentioned—and certainly none with a thousand steers. Moreover, under the suppositious case the Senator has suggested, such a feeder would not be able to show financial distress or hardship. But the bill requires that he show financial hardship.

Moreover, no one in any of these counties—and it must be remembered that these distress-stricken areas are generally designated by counties or by certain portions of counties—has gone into the business of getting a thousand steers in one of these distress-stricken areas, in anticipation of encountering a drought. If he is in one of these disaster-stricken counties, it seems to me he should be able to feed any stock he had at the time when the disaster developed, with the feed provided under such a relief measure.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I think the legislative record has been made abundantly clear; namely, that this legislation is for the purpose of assisting farmers who are operating herds on pastures that are destroyed by drought conditions. If such cattle happened to be steers the farmer owned prior to the passage of this act, I think they would come under the provisions of this measure.

From his experience in the cattle business, the Senator well knows that the feeders feed their cattle carbohydrates or some form of cottonseed or other feed cake which puts the best flesh on the animals. If animals are on feed, I do not think they would come under the provisions of this bill. If they are or have been in pasture, I think they would come under them. As heretofore stated in the debate, one in the business of feeding livestock would not come under the financial requirement, on page 3, in line 9—"are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned by them."

If the owner is in the business of feeding cattle, he has some equity in the cattle. He can acquire credit through normal channels of trade and could not

have to come to the Federal Government to obtain disaster relief.

So I see no possibility of the existence of any loopholes in that connection, with the result that, in the absence of this amendment, someone in the cattle-feeding business could obtain this Government subsidy. The bill was not introduced for that purpose; the committee did not report the bill for that purpose; the Senate is not considering the bill for that purpose; and the bill could be used for that purpose only if a combination of thieves got together for the purpose of distorting the intent of the law.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then does the Senator from Georgia agree that the intent of the bill and of the amendments which have been adopted is to make it clear that the bill provides no relief for a speculator or feeder or for someone who purchases cattle with the intent of obtaining the benefit of the 75-percent provision?

Mr. TALMADGE. I certainly agree with the Senator from South Dakota; and I think that has been made abundantly clear throughout the legislative history which has been written by means of this debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is also my understanding.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is also my understanding.

Mr. President, if the Senator in charge of the bill makes that interpretation, and if the Senator from Delaware, who raised this question, is satisfied, certainly I am satisfied, because I do not think there was any intent of that sort in the first place.

Mr. TALMADGE. Then, Mr. President, I certainly hope the bill will be passed, so that the feeding of these starving cattle can begin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2197) was passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 107(a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby the disaster area for use in the disaster area, the value of such hay, as determined by the Secretary, being deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage. The authority of the Secretary to permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage because of damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall expire on June 30, 1962. Any deduction made from conservation reserve payments because of any hay removal under this paragraph or because of grazing under section 107(a) (4), may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be reduced by an amount equal to any sums expended by the*

producer, but not to exceed one dollar per acre, for the purposes of grasshopper control operations on the acreage from which the hay is removed or which is grazed."

SEC. 2. Section 107(a) (4) of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Under the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the grazing of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby the disaster area by livestock normally maintained in the disaster area, the value of such grazing to be deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage."

SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the following: "and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such area, the President, pursuant to Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned by them."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective only until June 30, 1962.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### PROCUREMENT POLICIES OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, criticism of the needless expenditures of millions of the taxpayers' dollars through the inexcusable waste and mismanagement by the loose procurement policies of the Defense Department has become an almost daily occurrence. The danger lies not altogether in the specific cases of waste which have been mentioned, but rather in the callous disregard by the procurement officers of the Defense Department of their responsibility to end this waste.

When the Department of Defense appropriation requests are before the Congress, Members have been very reluctant to cut these appropriations, because we want to be sure that adequate funds are provided to meet the security requirements of our country. Perhaps this desire has resulted in our becoming just a little careless in demanding greater efficiency. While we do want to be sure to provide every dollar that is needed to



safeguard our defense, nevertheless, the time has come when Congress must put a tighter clamp on the Nation's purse strings, and this means on the loose spending habits of the military, in particular.

Taking away from the Defense Department some of its requested funds, and then demanding that the remaining funds be spent more efficiently, may be the answer. Perhaps the request that some of the officials responsible turn in their resignations may be in order.

As one Member of the Senate, I am getting very impatient at the shopworn excuse which is offered by the Defense Department each time the Comptroller General calls to our attention specific examples of indefensible waste and mismanagement, when all they say is, "We will correct this situation and do better the next time."

This excuse has been repeated over and over for the past several years, and I think it is about time we insist that the "next time" be "now."

Today again I call the attention of the Senate to two additional reports submitted by the Comptroller General, both dated June 30, 1961, and both dealing with situations where millions of dollars have been unnecessarily wasted by the Defense Department. Both reports contain the shopworn promise of the Defense Department to do better the next time.

I shall place in the RECORD a detailed summary of these two reports, but first I shall quote from the Comptroller General's Report No. B-122261, dated June 30, 1961:

Our review disclosed that millions of dollars' worth of replacement equipment was needlessly purchased in fiscal year 1960 because the Air Force does not have an effective means of knowing the quantity and location of the equipment it already owns. On the basis of our review, we estimated that over \$6.7 million worth of replacement equipment purchased in fiscal year 1960 could have been avoided, and requirements for another \$20.8 million, on which procurement was deferred principally for lack of funds, could have been eliminated had the Air Force maintained effective control over the equipment procured and received in the supply system.

In this report the Comptroller General cited a specific example wherein 852 generator sets valued at approximately \$14 million were not even accounted for in the reported inventory data.

On this one sample audit which was made by the Comptroller General it was shown that about \$164 million worth of items had been procured but were not properly included in inventory reports. Had these inventories been properly recorded, the Comptroller General said, the Defense Department requirements in that one area "for fiscal year 1960 could have been further reduced by \$20.8 million."

There can be no possible excuse for this Department having over \$164 million worth of inventory on hand without such inventory being properly carried on the books.

The second report is No. B-133372 also dated June 30, 1961, and, as I stated

earlier we find the same criticism in this audit report.

I quote the Comptroller General's comments on this audit:

We found that the military departments had purchased new items of production equipment costing over \$700,000 without having considered suitable and available idle equipment assets on hand within the Department of Defense. We found also that unnecessary administrative costs are being incurred because there are four independent organizations, and numerous supporting activities, performing the same or similar management functions. Combining these organizations and activities could be expected to effect significant reductions in present administrative costs which exceed \$3 million annually.

Continuing, the Comptroller General said:

Our review disclosed that the military departments expended \$587,461 during 1959 and 1960 in 34 procurement actions for 45 new items of production equipment instead of using idle assets available within DOD.

Both of these reports are full of specific examples of the Defense Department buying equipment and parts when at the same time, had the inventories been properly recorded, the Department would have known that it had more than an adequate supply on hand.

Both of these reports are typical of the periodic criticisms which are called to our attention by the Comptroller General's office, wherein the Defense Department completely ignores any semblance of sound business practices in administering the Department.

This wasted money represents not only a loss to the American taxpayers, but also less defense for the United States.

The Comptroller General and his staff have been and are doing an excellent job of calling these situations to the attention of the Congress, but I suggest that in the future they include in their reports a more specific identification of the procurement officers who are in charge of the arsenals, wherein these loose practices are found. Then Congress can deal specifically with those responsible.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have a summary of each of the two reports I have referred to incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1961.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed is our report on review of management within the Department of the Air Force of replacement equipment subject to the Air Force Unit Authorization List (UAL) reporting system. This review was made for the purpose of examining into the effectiveness and efficiency of Air Force management of such equipment.

Our review disclosed that millions of dollars' worth of replacement equipment was needlessly purchased in fiscal year 1960 because the Air Force does not have an effective means of knowing the quantity and location of the equipment it already owns.

Our review was limited to about 1 percent of the items and 12 percent of the value of the \$2.8 billion inventory reported. In this review we established that about \$164 million worth of the items selected for examination had been previously procured but was neither included by using organizations in the inventory reports used in computing the requirements nor otherwise accounted for.

On the basis of our review, we estimated that over \$6.7 million worth of replacement equipment purchased in fiscal year 1960 could have been avoided, and requirements for another \$20.8 million, on which procurement was deferred principally for lack of funds, could have been eliminated had the Air Force maintained effective control over the equipment procured and received in the supply system. For example, in our selected review of family grouping 6115AA1W—generator set, we found that 852 sets, valued at approximately \$14 million were not accounted for in reported inventory data. At organizations visited, our review disclosed that eight generator sets which should have been reported were not included in the UAL data used by the Sacramento Air Materiel Area (SMAMA) in the fiscal year 1960 computation. The computation made by SMAMA showed a buy requirement for fiscal year 1960 of 266 units. As no adjustment was made for the 852 unaccounted-for assets, and purchase of 101 units was deferred, procurement action was initiated for an additional 165 units at an estimated cost of \$2.8 million. Had the Air Force maintained effective control over the units procured and received into the supply system, there would not have been 852 unaccounted-for units, and a sufficient number of such units should have been available for use so that procurement of the additional 165 units at an estimated cost of \$2.8 million would have been unnecessary while requirements for another 101 units at an estimated cost of \$1.7 million could have been eliminated.

Since our review was very limited, we are of the opinion that there are substantially more unaccounted-for equipment and substantially more unnecessary procurement than we estimated on the basis of our findings.

We brought our findings and conclusions to the attention of agency officials. In a letter dated January 23, 1961, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Materiel) agreed, generally, that the products of the Air Force UAL system are incomplete and inaccurate and do not adequately support the Air Materiel Command in the computation of equipment procurement requirements. The Assistant Secretary informed us of a number of actions already taken and others proposed which in the opinion of the Air Force should materially alleviate the deficiencies in UAL reporting that now exist.

The success of the actions taken, as well as those planned, is largely prospective in nature and their effectiveness will depend upon the manner in which they are carried out. Accordingly, we are not prepared to say whether the actions taken and planned by the Air Force will successfully overcome the serious and widespread problems observed by us.

In subsequent reviews of Air Force supply management activities, we plan to make further inquiries into the Air Force's management of replacement equipment and the effectiveness of the proposed improvement program.

This report is also being sent to the President of the Senate. Copies are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Air Force.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, H.R. 1986, to repeal certain provisions of the Railway Mail Pay Act which became law 45 years ago, has been the subject of extensive public hearings, held on June 15, 22, and 23 of this year.

This measure has been carefully studied, all views of the effects of enactment have been weighed, and the committee has concluded that favorable action is necessary if the Railway Express Agency is to survive as a private enterprise. The committee is in agreement that survival of REA is in the public interest.

The section of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, which would be repealed by H.R. 1986, has two basic provisions:

First. It provides that the Postmaster General shall obtain from the Interstate Commerce Commission information showing revenue received by railroad companies from express companies for the transportation of express matter.

Second. It authorizes the Postmaster General to reduce rail rates paid by the Post Office Department to the railroads for carrying non-first-class mail to the level of the express rail rates, if the express rates are lower.

These provisions were designed to prevent rate discrimination by the railroads against the Government in the transportation of non-first-class mail. Since cost-ascertainment procedures were crude at that time, these provisions gave the Government the best known test of reasonableness—rate comparison. The Postmaster General, from time to time, has requested the ICC to furnish information as provided by law on rail rates for carrying express matter. The Commission, in declining such a request, stated in effect that the law does not place upon it the duty to make an investigation for the purpose of formulating rail rates for the carriage of express matter.

The ICC has contended that the Railway Express Agency has never operated on a profit-and-loss basis, since it simply turned over to the railroads whatever amounts it had left after deducting its operating expenses at the end of each month. REA always broke even on its own books, although the business as a whole has been losing money for years. Because of the contractual arrangements between the railroads and REA, the ICC has held that rates, as such, were not paid, and that for this reason the provisions of the 1916 law could not be complied with.

Revitalization of the Express Agency is now going forward. Under the direction of a young and forward-looking president, REA has in recent years greatly reduced its annual losses. The provisions of the old law, however, stand in the way of the agency's return to solvency. Under the terms of a new contract between REA and the railroads, scheduled to become effective July 1, 1961, the express company would change its method of operation to one based upon profit and loss, and it could then

be construed that rates were being paid. The railroads and the express company fear that the provisions which H.R. 1986 would repeal might then be invoked. This could result in huge losses to the railroads in rates paid by the Post Office Department for the transportation of non-first-class mail.

Opponents of this measure have contended that H.R. 1986 would remove a restraint on the railroads and would permit below-cost charges to REA which would be difficult or impossible to discover and which would permit REA to make below-cost rates to the public, thus unfairly injuring competition.

I have been assured by the Interstate Commerce Commission, in correspondence contained in the report on H.R. 1986, that the ICC has authority—beyond the provisions of the Railway Mail Pay Act—to require and make public the rate information which it was feared would be suppressed. I am convinced that ICC possess all the authority it requires to prevent any destructive business practices by either REA or the railroads. Upon the basis of assurances given to the committee by ICC, and in the face of clear evidence that the Express Agency's revitalization will fail unless congressional action is taken, this measure has been favorably reported.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I concur in the statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in regard to the pending legislation. Full hearings, which extended over a period of 3 days, were held. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee. It had been approved by every agency of the Government. It costs the Government no money. I sincerely hope the Senate will act favorably on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE SOIL BANK ACT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to express my gratification that S. 2197, which amends the Soil Bank Act so as to make feed available to drought-stricken States and providing other relief, has been passed by the Senate this afternoon.

I am particularly gratified at the understanding and tolerance of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. He interposed some objections and raised questions on the bill. Yet, upon assur-

ance from those of us from the Midwest and the members of the committee and upon the approval of certain amendments, he was willing to compromise.

It is fortunate for the citizens of my State of Nebraska that we are not in the drought-stricken area, but we know of the hardship of a drought. The States to the north and west of us are now suffering these hardships.

On their behalf and on behalf of our own people in Nebraska, I express gratification to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for reporting the bill and successfully guiding it through to passage.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I compliment the Senator from Nebraska for the many contributions he made to the bill having to do with relief for the drought-stricken areas of the Midwest and the Northern Plains. It was because of what he did that I believe we were in large part successful in getting a bill that was unanimously approved by the Senate and sent to the House this afternoon.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Montana is always generous, even as he is now.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, on Monday the unobjected to items on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 458 will be discussed. The Senate will consider also Calendar No. 443, S. 1459, a bill to amend the provisions of law relating to longevity step increases for postal employees. On that measure there will very likely be a yea-and-nay vote, and I think Senators should be on notice.

#### ORDER FOR CALENDAR CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the morning hour, the Senate proceed to the consideration of items on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 458.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### THE GERMAN AND BERLIN SITUATIONS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, during the last month I have made two statements in the Senate on the Berlin issue.

One suggested that the President and the Secretary of State draw into consultation men of both parties—men with wide experience and political judgment—



who had dealt directly with the German and Berlin issues since World War II. Such consultation would serve two purposes: It would give confidence to the Nation that these issues are receiving the fullest and best consideration, and it would provide for the President the widest base of support.

My second statement suggested that it is better to keep open the channels of communication with the Soviet Union, regarding our rights in Berlin and access thereto, than to be faced later with the question of deciding whether we will discuss these rights with East Germany.

For if the Soviet Union should sign a peace treaty with East Germany, we will be faced, at some time, with this question: Will the United States negotiate with East Germany over these rights, thereby admitting, even de facto, the status quo of East Germany—or, as the Soviet Union would contend, admitting the sovereignty of East Germany?

And, if we should refuse to discuss these rights with East Germany after a peace treaty, we know that situations could be provoked, such as the blocking of our access routes, which would require the United States to decide whether it would use force, and commit itself to the possibility of war.

In making these suggestions, I did not attempt to offer specific details or plans regarding the Berlin issue. The ultimate decision is the President's; he ought to have latitude to develop the specifics of the implementation of our rights in Berlin, and the defense of the freedom of West Berlin. And, he ought to have the freedom to consider and propose every honorable means to preserve these rights without war.

The phrase "stand firm" is not the beginning and end of our policy respecting Berlin. To the extent that it expresses firm support of the principles that the United States is in Berlin, and has access thereto, as a matter of right, and that we are committed to the defense of the freedom of the people of West Berlin, the phrase has meaning. These rights are not negotiable.

But if the phrase "stand firm" means the fixed position that the President ought not to examine the realities of the situation, or communicate with Soviet Russia, or take any honorable means to prevent the commencement of hostilities which might expand into a third world war, I disagree.

And I disagree unequivocally with those who, using the term "stand firm," consider it appeasement if any attempt is made by Members of Congress, or by the Executive, to discuss Berlin, except in dogmatic or belligerent terms.

I suggest today two areas in which the President, and the Congress, can give greater meaning to the term "stand firm."

First. Let us stand firm by taking every step, at whatever cost, to assure that the United States has the military power, ready and effective, to support our country in this crisis over Berlin.

We know that the object of our military power is to deter war. But it is also to protect this country, and its freedom, for freedom could perish without power.

And today our ability to deal with the Soviet Union on the Berlin issue depends upon our military power, as well as diplomacy.

For 8 years, our military strength has been questioned by Members of the Congress, by military leaders—chiefly after retirement—and by President Kennedy himself during the past campaign.

I have no reason to doubt the statements made by President Eisenhower last year, by President Kennedy this year, and by Secretary of Defense McNamara that our defenses are adequate. But I must say frankly that I would like to know more about our defenses, and I believe my position is shared by other Members of the Congress.

We have great confidence in the members of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees who are charged primarily with responsibility respecting our defenses. It can be argued that every Member of the Congress can secure adequate information by attending meetings of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, reading reports, and listening to debates. But I know from my experience, and my own efforts to secure information, that this system provides Members with a very sketchy outline of defense policies and programs.

Therefore, I suggest that the Secretary of Defense and his Department present to the entire Congress—organized in appropriate groups—full information, within the limits of security, regarding our present strength, and regarding their policies and plans.

Policies to provide military power must be established by those who have expert knowledge—by the Secretary of Defense and his advisers, and ultimately by the President. But it is the duty of the Congress—and I believe its most vital duty today—to provide, at whatever cost, the organization and means to assure the security of this Nation.

It is to enable the Congress to discharge more effectively this vital duty, and to assure the fullest support in this time of the Berlin crisis, that I make this suggestion. I hope that it will be considered by the appropriate committees of the Congress, and by the executive branch.

It would enable the full membership of the Senate—if we will work at it—to carry out the constitutional and now mortal duty to provide an effective defense system. If this is done, the confidence that our country is militarily prepared to meet any danger will be communicated to the Nation, and to our allies.

Second. Let us stand firm on the President's foreign aid program.

The newspapers report today that compromises are being considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and perhaps by the administration.

I have spoken many times in past years upon the importance of developing a foreign aid program which would insure continuity of at least 5 years, and assure its financing by authorizing the foreign aid agency to borrow from the Treasury. I will not repeat these arguments today.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at the

close of my remarks the speech which I made on this subject over a year ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, our foreign aid program—supported by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, and by the Congress—has continued since World War II. And whatever the objections, we know it will continue in the years ahead. This being true, we are irresponsible whenever we do not provide the means for its effective organization—economy in the use of our funds, effective use by the countries which receive our aid, and assurance to these countries that the United States will continue to support their economic development as well as their political independence and freedom—for the two are inseparable.

I hope earnestly that the newspaper reports are not true—that the President will not compromise, that the leaders of his party in the Senate and the House will not compromise. If they will stand firm, there are many Republicans who will support them—and the Congress will stand firm on the President's program—a program substantially recommended by President Eisenhower.

A victory in the foreign-aid program at this crucial time will demonstrate to our country, to our allies, and to the world that the Congress supports the President, that it has confidence that we will come through the Berlin crisis, and that it has confidence in the maintenance of our leadership in the world. This I contend, is a positive step, a stand-firm policy which can help in this time of crisis.

One further word. If national defense, and foreign aid, call for expenditures too burdensome for our budget and present tax levies, I submit that the President should call for, and the Congress should enact, additional taxes—even a sales tax paid by all during this crisis—for no burden is too great when the security and freedom of our country are at stake.

Let us stand firm by acts—and not by words alone.

#### EXHIBIT 1

I believe that if the foreign-aid program is to survive, it demands a reorganization by the executive branch, and by the Congress.

One of the chief reasons for the growing disillusionment over our foreign-aid program, in my view, is that many people do not believe that it is as effective as it could be, considering the amount of money that we appropriate each year. From my observations for a short time in another country, that was my belief—that it is not as effectively used as it should be, and that it demands reorganization.

I wish to suggest a few points today which I believe this administration, or the incoming administration, and the Congress and its appropriate committees might take into consideration in the formulation of a foreign-aid program for the future.

My first point is that military assistance and defense support should be stricken from the mutual security bill and placed in the defense budget.

The second point I make—and I believe this is the most important of all—is that if a foreign-aid program is to be truly effective







87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# S. 2197

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 17, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

---

## AN ACT

To amend section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended,  
4       is further amended by adding at the end thereof the follow-  
5       ing: "The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, per-  
6       mit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage  
7       adjacent to or nearby the disaster area for use in the disaster  
8       area, the value of such hay, as determined by the Secretary,  
9       being deducted from the annual payment applicable to such  
10      acreage. The authority of the Secretary to permit the re-  
11      moval of hay from conservation reserve acreage because of



1 damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought,  
2 flood, or other natural disaster shall expire on June 30,  
3 1962. Any deduction made from conservation reserve pay-  
4 ments because of any hay removal under this paragraph or  
5 because of grazing under section 107 (a) (4) may, in the  
6 discretion of the Secretary, be reduced by an amount equal  
7 to any sums expended by the producer, but not to exceed  
8 one dollar per acre, for the purposes of grasshopper control  
9 operations on the acreage from which the hay is removed  
10 or which is grazed.”

11 SEC. 2. Section 107 (a) (4) of the Soil Bank Act is  
12 amended by adding at the end thereof the following: “Un-  
13 der the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve  
14 acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering  
15 caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster,  
16 the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the  
17 grazing of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby  
18 the disaster area by livestock normally maintained in the  
19 disaster area, the value of such grazing to be deducted from  
20 the annual payment applicable to such acreage.”

21 SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as  
22 amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the  
23 end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the  
24 following: “and shall make feed owned or controlled by it  
25 available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the

1 current support price for such feed (or a comparable price  
2 if there is no current support price) for assistance in the  
3 preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the  
4 United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurri-  
5 cane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other  
6 catastrophe in such area, the President, pursuant to Public  
7 Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, determines that an emer-  
8 gency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be  
9 made available only to persons who do not have, and are  
10 unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without  
11 undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned  
12 by them."

13 SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall be  
14 effective only until June 30, 1962.

Passed the Senate July 14, 1961.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,

*Secretary.*



---

## AN ACT

To amend section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

---

JULY 17, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

## CONTENTS

Issued July 21, 1961  
For actions of July 20, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 122

Adjournment.....	9,20
Appropriations.....	3,5,11
CCC appraisals.....	3
Cheese imports.....	23
Civil defense.....	18
Committees.....	8
Conservation reserve.....	1
Education.....	28
Electrification.....	24
Ethics.....	7
Farm labor.....	31
Farm program.....	1,10,19
Foreign aid.....	12,19,21
Foreign trade.....	29
Forestry.....	13
4-H Clubs.....	16
Grants-in-aid.....	26
Legislative program.....	19

Livestock and poultry.....	13
National parkways.....	27
Nomination.....	14
Personnel.....	6
Recreation.....	27
Research.....	15,32
Small business.....	30
Surplus commodities.....	29
Surplus grain.....	2
Textile imports.....	25
Transportation.....	17
Water pollution.....	33
Water resources.....	4,22
Wildlife.....	2

**HIGHLIGHTS:** House committee voted to report farm bill and bill to permit removal of hay on conservation reserve acreage adjacent to disaster areas. Committee received permission to report these bills this weekend. House agreed to conference report on general Government - Commerce appropriation bill. Sen. Proxmire submittee amendment to farm bill to provide individual producer milk allotments in local areas. Senate passed legislative branch appropriation bill.

## HOUSE

- 1. FARM PROGRAM.** The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 8230, the omnibus farm bill, and S. 2197, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the removal of hay from, or grazing on, conservation reserve lands adjacent to or near disaster areas (pp. D596-7). The Committee was granted until midnight Sat., July 22, to file reports on these bills (p. 12163).
- 2. SURPLUS GRAIN.** The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment S. 614, to permit the States in emergency situations to obtain grain from CCC to prevent starvation of resident game birds and other resident wildlife (H. Rept. 746). p. 12184
- 3. CCC APPRAISALS.** The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment S. 763, to authorize annual appropriations to reimburse CCC for net realized losses sustained during any fiscal year in lieu of annual appropriations to restore capital impairment based on annual Treasury appraisals. The bill provides for the amount of net gain or loss realized by CCC to be determined from the Corporation's financial statements as of the end of each fiscal year instead of requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to make an annual independent appraisal of the Corporation's assets and liabilities for the purpose of determining the net worth of the Corporation. (H. Rept. 751). p. 12184



4. WATER RESOURCES. The Rules Committee reported a rule for the consideration of H. R. 30, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact. pp. 12122, 12184
5. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7577, the general Government matters-Commerce appropriation bill for 1962, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. 12135-9). See Digest 121 for items of interest. The Appropriations Committee was granted until midnight Fri., July 21, to file a report on the military construction appropriation bill for 1962. p. 12122
6. PERSONNEL. Subcommittee No. 2 of the Judiciary Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 4131, to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel. p. D597
7. ETHICS. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments H. R. 8140, to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest (H. Rept. 748). p. 12184
8. COMMITTEES. Received reports of the House committees on salaries and expenses of the committees for the 6-months period ending June 30, 1961. pp. 12178-84
9. ADJOURNED until Mon., July 24. pp. 12153, 12178

SENATE

10. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Proxmire submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to S. 1643, the omnibus farm bill, which would amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to provide for individual producer milk allotments in local and regional marketing areas. He stated that the proposed amendment "would permit dairy farmers to adopt milk sales allotments for individual dairy farms which would enable them to manage total marketing of milk from each such farm in line with their sales of fluid milk." pp. 12034-5  
Sen. Miller inserted an article critical of the omnibus farm bill. pp. 12061-2
11. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. Passed as reported this bill, H. R. 7208 (pp. 12085-6, 12092-6). Conferees were appointed (p. 12096).
12. FOREIGN AID. The Foreign Relations Committee was granted permission to file a report during adjournment of the Senate this week-end on S. 1983, the foreign aid authorization bill. p. 12021  
Sen. Humphrey discussed the importance of the foreign aid program and inserted an editorial, "Long-Term Foreign Aid," and a copy of a joint letter from Secretaries Rusk and Dillion to members of Congress "commenting on some of the more controversial sections of the foreign-aid program." pp. 12049-51  
Sen. Williams, Del., inserted an article critical of the foreign aid program. p. 12091
13. THE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE reported the following bills: p. 12022  
S. 860, without amendment, to grant the Secretary of Agriculture additional authority for protection against the introduction and dissemination of disease of livestock and poultry (S. Report 582).  
H. R. 2249, without amendment, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a tract of forest land in Calif. to Trinity County (S. Rept. 580).  
H. R. 2250, without amendment, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture



Association; Carl A. Bimson, of Phoenix, J. O. Elmer of San Francisco, and Harry P. Bergmann, of Washington, all representing the American Bankers Association; Ralph W. Pitman, T. C. Boushall, and Robert A. Fischer, all of the Consumer Bankers Association; and William J. Foley, Maine Merchants Association.

Hearings continue on Monday, July 24.

#### STEAMSHIP CONFERENCES

*Committee on Commerce:* Committee continued its hearings on H.R. 6775, to provide for the operation of steamship conferences, with testimony from W. Errington Keville, chairman, General Council of British Shipping, Pieter C. van Houten, vice chairman, Committee of European Shipowners (Continent and Scandinavia), and George Andersen, Danish Shipowners Association, all of whom were accompanied by their associates.

Hearings continue on Wednesday, July 26.

#### EMPLOYEE STOCK OPTIONS

*Committee on Finance:* Committee held hearings on S. 1625, to terminate the special tax treatment now accorded certain employee stock options, with testimony from Michael Waris, Jr., Associate Tax Legislative Counsel, Department of the Treasury; Lewis D. Gilbert, New York City; James B. Carey, AFL-CIO; Stanley L. Kaufman, New York City; Col. Lawrence I. Peak, California, Md.; and Chuncy Brooks, National Small Business Men's Association.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

#### FOREIGN AID

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* Committee continued its executive consideration of S. 1983, proposed foreign aid authorizations bill, but did not conclude action thereon, and will meet again tomorrow.

#### PUBLIC LANDS

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:* Subcommittee on Public Lands held hearings on the following bills:

S. 703, a private bill—with testimony from Senator Bartlett, and Harold R. Hochmuth, Bureau of Land Management;

S.J. Res. 29, establishing the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument—with testimony from Senator Javits and Frank E. Harrison, National Park Service;

S. 1155, authorizing the establishment of Fort Smith National Historic Site, Ark.—with testimony from Senator Fulbright and Representative Trimble;

S. 2111, increasing penalty for failing to properly mark islands and structures with warning devices pur-

suant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act—with testimony from Comdr. L. F. Sudnick, U.S. Coast Guard;

H.R. 7042, to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif.—with testimony from Representative Johnson of California, and Frank E. Harrison;

S. 98, authorizing provision of sanitary facilities to the Medora area adjoining the Theodore Roosevelt National Monument, N. Dak.—with testimony from Senator Young of North Dakota;

S. 799, relating to the sale of certain mineral lands in Alaska—with testimony from James F. Doyle, Bureau of Land Management; and

S. 888, a private bill.

Hearings continue tomorrow on other pending bills.

#### ANTITRUST—DRUG INDUSTRY

*Committee on the Judiciary:* The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee continued its hearings on S. 1552, to amend the antitrust laws with respect to the manufacture and distribution of drugs, receiving testimony from Dr. Walter Modell, Cornell University Medical College, and Dr. Allan M. Butler, Harvard Medical School.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

#### ORDERS OF DEPORTATION

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization held hearings on H.R. 187 and S. 2212, providing for the judicial review of orders of deportation, having as its witnesses David Carliner, Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers; Edward L. Dubroff, American Bar Association; Edward J. Ennis, American Civil Liberties Union; Miss Edith Lowenstein, American Council for Nationalities Service; Chester Shore, AVC; Timothy T. Bornstein, ADA; Oliver Stone, Friends Committee on National Legislation; and Albert E. Arent, representing several organizations.

Hearings were recessed subject to call of the Chair.

#### VETERANS

*Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:* Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, in executive session, approved for full committee consideration S. 349, proposed Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1961.

#### NOMINATION

*Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:* Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Robert E. Hampton, to be a member of the Civil Service Commission, prior to which action, in open session, testimony was received from Senator Beall and the nominee.



# House of Representatives

## Chamber Action

**Bills Introduced:** 21 public bills, H.R. 8271-8291; 10 private bills, H.R. 8292-8301; and 10 resolutions, H.J. Res. 491-494, H. Con. Res. 353, and H. Res. 378-382, were introduced.

Pages 12122, 12185

**Bills Reported:** Reports were filed as follows:

H. Res. 378, providing for the consideration of and 2 hours of debate on H.R. 30, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact (H. Rept. 745);

S. 614, relating to emergency feed for wildlife from Commodity Credit Corporation-owned surplus grains (H. Rept. 746);

H.R. 8095, amending the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (H. Rept. 747);

H.R. 8140, to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest, amended (H. Rept. 748);

H.R. 1378, a private bill (H. Rept. 749);

H.R. 8033, amending the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to review of recommended orders of hearing officers (H. Rept. 750); and

S. 763, authorizing annual appropriations for reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation for net losses incurred (H. Rept. 751).

Page 12184

**Military Construction Appropriations:** The Committee on Appropriations was granted permission to file by midnight Friday a report on a bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1962.

Page 12122

**Nigerian Prime Minister:** The calling of a recess by the Speaker was made in order at any time on Wednesday, July 26, for the purpose of receiving the Prime Minister of Nigeria (no joint meeting).

Page 12122

**Speaker's Service:** Concluded legislative action on H. Con. Res. 342, authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes extended to Hon. Sam Rayburn, by agreeing to Senate amendments thereto.

Page 12122

**NASA Authorizations:** By a record vote of 354 yeas to 59 nays the House adopted the conference report on H.R. 6874, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and sent the legislation to the Senate.

Also adopted H. Con. Res. 353, authorizing the making of a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 6874

Pages 12122-12126

**Reorganization (NLRB):** By a record vote of 231 yeas to 179 nays the House adopted H. Res. 328, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961. This action in

effect rejects Reorganization Plan No. 5, providing for reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board.

Pages 12126-12135

**General Government-Commerce Appropriations:** By a voice vote the House adopted the conference report on H.R. 7577, making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the Department of Commerce, and sundry agencies for fiscal year 1962, and sent the legislation to the Senate. Four amendments were reported in disagreement and on which the House voted as follows:

To recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 3 relating to aviation war risk insurance revolving fund.

On Senate amendments 12 and 13 the House receded and concurred with amendments that reduced by \$106,000 and \$500,000 the funds provided for the Bureau of Foreign Commerce and the "promotion of international travel," respectively.

The House rejected a preferential motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 15, reducing certain operating-differential subsidies for vessels temporarily operating in the Caribbean, and voted to insist on its disagreement to the amendment.

Pages 12135-12139

**Legislative Program:** The legislative program for the week of July 24-29 was announced by the majority leader.

Pages 12141-12142

**Calendar Wednesday:** Agreed to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business of July 26.

Page 12153

**Reorganization (Maritime Functions):** By a record vote of 184 yeas to 215 nays the House rejected a preferential motion to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of H. Res. 336, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 7 providing for the reorganization of maritime functions. This action in effect approves the plan.

Pages 12140-12152

**Farm Bill:** The Committee on Agriculture was granted permission to file by midnight Saturday a report on H.R. 8230, the general farm bill.

Page 12163

**Record Votes:** During the proceedings of the House today three record votes developed and they appear on pages 12125-12126, 12134-12135, and 12152.

**Program for Monday:** Adjourned at 5:58 p.m. until Monday, July 24, at 12 o'clock noon. For program see Congressional Program Ahead in this Digest.

## Committee Meetings

### GENERAL FARM BILL—SOIL BANK ACT

**Committee on Agriculture:** Met in executive session and ordered reported favorably to the House the following bills:



~~H.R. 8230 (amended), to improve and protect farm prices and farm income, to adjust supplies of agricultural commodities in line with the requirements therefor, to improve distribution and expand exports of agricultural commodities, to liberalize and extend farm credit services, to protect the interests of consumers; and S. 2197 (amended), to amend the Soil Bank Act.~~

#### SUGAR

*Committee on Agriculture:* Subcommittee on Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations met in executive session regarding sugar legislation and proposed allocation to foreign countries under the Sugar Act.

#### SHIPYARD FACILITIES

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Utilization of Naval Shipyard Facilities heard testimony from Kenneth E. BeLieu, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics); Vice Adm. John Sylvester, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics); Rear Adm. Ralph K. James, Chief, Bureau of Ships, Navy; and Capt. D. L. Carroll, Jr., Acting Assistant Chief, Bureau of Ships for Field Activities. Hearings continue Friday, July 21.

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

*Committee on Banking and Currency:* Met in executive session and ordered reported to the House the following measures:

S. 614, to authorize the use of Commodity Credit Corporation-owned surplus grain for emergency use in the feeding of game birds and other resident wildlife; and

S. 763, to authorize annual appropriation to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained during any fiscal year.

Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

#### URBAN RENEWAL

*Committee on the District of Columbia:* Subcommittee No. 1 held a hearing on H.R. 6312, to amend the D.C. Redevelopment Act of 1945. Heard testimony from Walter E. Washington, Assistant Commissioner of Redevelopment, Housing and Home Finance Agency; and public witnesses.

Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

#### JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

*Committee on Education and Labor:* Special Subcommittee on Education met in executive session and reported to the full committee H.R. 7178 (amended), relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses.

#### TEXTILE INDUSTRY

*Committee on Education and Labor:* Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment heard testimony regarding the textile industry from Representatives Scranton, Hemphill, and Whitener. Hearings continue Friday, July 21.

#### FOREIGN AID

*Committee on Foreign Affairs:* Met in executive session to continue markup on H.R. 7372, to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the U.S. by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security. The committee will continue on this subject, in executive session, Friday, July 21.

#### FAR EAST—PACIFIC

*Committee on Foreign Affairs:* Subcommittee on Far East and Pacific met in executive session for a briefing. No announcements were made.

#### VIRGIN ISLANDS—GUAM

*Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:* Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 5358, to dissolve the Virgin Islands Corporation; and H.R. 5309, to amend the Organic Act of Guam.

Testimony was given on H.R. 5358 by John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Interior, accompanied by other Interior officials; and representatives of the General Accounting Office. Heard on H.R. 5309 was the Director, Office of Territories, Interior Department.

The subcommittee adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

#### BROADCASTING HOURS

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:* Subcommittee on Communications and Power concluded hearings on H.R. 2745, and related bills, relating to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations, and heard public witnesses.

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:* Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics concluded hearings on H.R. 5978, and related bills, to amend section 202(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act relating to terminal area motor carrier operations performed by or for common carriers by water in interstate commerce. Heard testimony from Rupert Murphy, Commissioner, Interstate Commerce Commission; and public witnesses.

#### JUDICIAL MISCELLANY

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee No. 2 ordered reported to the full committee H.R. 4131 (amended), to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel; and H.R. 4917, for the relief of Albany County, N.Y.

Also took testimony and acted on several private claim bills.





July 22, 1961

9. SOIL BANK. The Agriculture Committee reported (on July 22, during adjournment) with amendment S. 2197, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage adjacent to disaster areas (H. Rept. 753). p. 12235
10. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Rep. Mathias discussed the sale of surplus agricultural commodities to iron curtain countries, saying "this is nothing more than granting American foreign aid to Russia through the back door of the Department of Agriculture." pp. 12233-4
11. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 3059, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the purchase of retirement credit by employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees. p. D605
12. TARIFFS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 6611, to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents. p. 12188
13. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported (on July 21, during adjournment) appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for 1962 (H. Rept. 752). p. D604
14. PUBLIC LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments H. R. 2925, to amend the act of March 8, 1922, so as to permit the sale of certain isolated tracts of public lands in Alaska (H. Rept. 757). p. 12235  
The Subcommittee on Forests of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 3880, to provide for the conveyance of a tract of national forest land to the town of Afton, Wyo. p. D604

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

15. SUGARBEETS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Langen inserting a Minn. State Legislature resolution urging an increase in sugarbeet allotments for the Minn. farmers. p. A5589
16. CHEESE IMPORTS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley inserting his recent radio address discussing problems confronting Wisc., opposing the proposal to increase cheese imports and highlighting the important features of the farm bill. pp. A5590-1
17. LABELING. Extension of remarks of Rep. Broyhill inserting a statement presented by the Federation of Homemakers expressing their views and opinions on proposed regulations under the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act. pp. A5591-2
18. EXPENDITURES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Horan inserting the joint statement of Treasury Secretary Dillon and Budget Director Bell on budget receipts and expenditures. pp. A5608-9
19. WATER RESOURCES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dingell inserting an article, "Water: Precious and Polluted." pp. A5618-9
20. EDUCATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Bailey discussing the Federal aid to education and inserting a summary of Federal funds for education, fiscal year 1959, including funds administered by this Department. pp. A5620-2



Extension of remarks of Rep. Harsha inserting an editorial and stating that "it points out very vividly the problems that are created ... by the failure of Congress to renew or extend the Federal impacted area legislation and financial assistance for schools thereunder." p. A5631

Extension of remarks of Rep. Dingell inserting a Detroit Commission letter setting forth their views on proposals to improve the National Defense Education Act and a statement in support of the proposed Youth Opportunities Act. pp. A5631-3

21. PATENTS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Roudebush urging support for his proposed bill "which is aimed at correcting an abuse of the patent system ..." p. A5623

22. FOOD. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley stating that "we have not yet, in my judgment, succeeded in developing an effective long-range, production-utilization food program," and discussing his proposal for a "more realistic national food policy." pp. A5639-40

23. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Derounian inserting an article discussing "the astonishing and questionable action of the TVA in announcing a reduction in electric rates ..." p. A5640

Extension of remarks of Rep. Martin inserting resolutions urging the appropriating of funds to continue construction of Colorado River storage project powerplants. p. A5644

24. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hall inserting his letter to Secretaries Dillon and Rusk expressing his views on the proposed foreign aid bill. p. A5643

25. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Derounian inserting an editorial, "Mr. Freeman, Meet the Farm Politicians," and stating that it "points up a lesson in politics for Secretary of Agriculture Freeman." pp. A5644-5

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

26. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. H. R. 8307, by Rep. Harvey, Ind., and H. R. 8319, by Rep. Teague, Calif., to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus agricultural commodities to such nations at prices less than those prices available to American consumers; to Agriculture Committee.

H. R. 8308, by Rep. Harvey, Ind., H. R. 8314, by Rep. Roudebush, and H. R. 8318, by Rep. Teague, Calif., to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to Agriculture Committee.

27. FEED GRAINS. H. R. 8306, by Rep. Findley, to provide a program to sell promptly America's price-depressing wheat and feed-grain surpluses without adversely affecting the income of wheat, feed-grain, and livestock producers; to Agriculture Committee.

28. GRANTS-IN-AID. H. R. 8310, by Rep. King, Utah, to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to State and local units of government; to Government Operations Committee.

## EMERGENCY FEED FOR LIVESTOCK

---

JULY 22, 1961.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 2197]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2197) to amend section 107(a)(3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the following: "and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of cattle (including producing dairy cattle), sheep, and goats, and their offspring, in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such areas, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for such livestock.

Amend the title to read:

A bill to amend section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

### STATEMENT

In previous acts (the most recent one Public Law 87-62) the Congress has authorized the Secretary to permit the grazing and cutting of hay from land in the conservation reserve within a disaster area when he determines such action necessary in order to meet emergency conditions caused by natural disaster. Sections 1 and 2 of S. 2197 would give the Secretary similar authority with respect to



grazing and cutting hay from conservation reserve acreage "adjacent to or nearby" such disaster areas.

Section 3 of the Senate bill would give the Secretary authority to make feed owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to livestock producers in such a disaster area at not less than 75 percent of the current support price but only if the President had determined an emergency to exist warranting such assistance pursuant to Public Law 875 of the 81st Congress. This would be a restriction on the existing authority of the Secretary to make feed available in such disaster areas, rather than a liberalization of this authority, as was presumably the intention of the authors of the bill.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

According to the best information available to the committee, the authority contained in sections 1 and 2 of the Senate bill is of relatively little significance. There is no indicated shortage of hay from commercial sources in the drought area now existing in this country and it is believed that the proposed authority to permit grazing and cutting of hay from conservation reserve acreage "adjacent to or nearby" the drought area would be of little benefit to livestock producers within the drought area.

The committee does believe, however, that it is important that CCC stocks of feed be made available to livestock producers in the drought area and that this be done without the restrictions which have been placed on the Secretary in section 3 of the Senate bill.

The committee has, therefore, amended the Senate bill by striking out the provisions relating to grazing and cutting of hay and has amended section 3 to permit the Secretary to sell feed owned or controlled by the CCC for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of livestock in areas where the Secretary deems that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance.

#### DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

The amendment to section 3 of the bill is in conformity with the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture in its report on the bill. That report, recommending enactment of the Senate bill with the suggested amendment of section 3, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1961.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
*Chairman, Agriculture Committee,*  
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: Senate bill 2197, on which the Department has been requested by the counsel of your committee to submit an immediate report would amend sections 107(a) 3 and 4 of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, to provide that upon certification of necessity by the Governor of a State the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster within a designated disaster area, permit grazing or removal of hay from conserva-

tion reserve acreage in areas adjacent to or nearby the designated disaster area. The approval of the contract signer to permit grazing or removal of hay from such acreage would be required.

It also included a proposed section 3 which would amend section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. As originally proposed, it provided that CCC on such terms as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem in the public interest, shall make feed owned or controlled by it available for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance. This provision was amended in the Senate to provide that the authority conferred thereby be limited to major disaster situations declared by the President under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and that feed be made available to distressed farmers at not less than 75 percent of current support price.

The result of the Senate action was to restrict the Department's ability to deal quickly in alleviating distress in drought areas in that it is required to take action under the slower procedures involved in operating under Public Law 875, 81st Congress. The Senate amendment provides no more authority to the Department than it has at present.

It appears from the debate in the Senate that some concern was expressed that Government-owned feed might be made available under this authority to commercial feeders. We propose a revised section 3 (draft attached) which would limit sales of feed to foundation herds of cattle including producing dairy cattle, sheep, and goats and their offspring owned by drought-stricken farmers. At the same time the revised section 3 would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to make the determination as to whether the extent of the distress in the areas involved is sufficient to warrant assistance of this kind.

The Department is desirous of giving all reasonable assistance as promptly as possible to farmers in areas which have sustained damage from natural disasters. Unfortunately, existing legislation sometimes makes it impossible to move with necessary dispatch. Section 3 of S. 2197 as it passed the Senate makes no improvement in existing legislation in this respect. Ma

The proposed amendment would permit more expeditious relief under section 407 and at the same time afford adequate safeguards against the indiscriminate use of such feed.

This Department recommends that the bill be passed with the revised section 3. This would give the Secretary more flexible authority to supply livestock feed in emergency areas.

Under the soil bank program, the Secretary may permit grazing and the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage within a designated disaster area. S. 2197 provides the same authority to the Secretary in areas adjacent to or nearby designated disaster areas and on the same basis.



Should this bill become law, it is contemplated that—

1. The Department will function under this authority in the same manner as it is presently operating within designated disaster areas.

2. Operations would be conducted under the direction of State and county ASC committees.

3. Hay removal or grazing would be authorized by the county committee upon application of the farmer who would agree to relet grazing rights to victims of the designated drought area or to sell hay only to such persons at not to exceed a fair value estimated by the county committee.

4. Conservation reserve payments otherwise due on such land would be reduced by the county committee's appraised value of the grazing or the hay.

There will be some additional administrative costs if this legislation is enacted. The additional cost will depend on the extent of natural disasters calling for such action. The additional expense would probably average about \$10 per farm taking advantage of the action authorized.

In view of the request that the report be submitted immediately, we have not obtained the advice from the Bureau of Budget regarding the relationship of this proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. MURPHY, *Under Secretary.*

#### CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as introduced, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in *italic*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

#### AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

\* \* \* \* \*

#### RESTRICTIONS ON SALES BY CCC

SEC. 407. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at any price not prohibited by this section. In determining sales policies for basic agricultural commodities or storable nonbasic commodities, the Corporation should give consideration to the establishing of such policies with respect to prices, terms, and conditions as it determines will not discourage or deter manufacturers, processors, and dealers from acquiring and carrying normal inventories of the commodity of the current crop. The Corporation shall not sell any basic agricultural commodity or storable nonbasic commodity at less than 5 per centum above the current support price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges: *Provided*, That effective with the beginning of the marketing year for the 1961 crop, the Corporation shall not sell any upland or extra long

staple cotton for unrestricted use at less than 15 per centum above the current support price for cotton plus reasonable carrying charges, except that the Corporation may, in an orderly manner and so as not to affect market prices unduly, sell for unrestricted use at the market price at the time of sale a number of bales of cotton equal to the number of bales by which the national marketing quota for such marketing year is reduced below the estimated domestic consumption and exports for such marketing year pursuant to the provisions of section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (A) sales for new or byproduct uses; (B) sales of peanuts and oilseeds for the extraction of oil; (C) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is a danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage; (E) sales for the purpose of establishing claims arising out of contract or against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity; (F) sales for export; (G) sales of wool; and (H) sales for other than primary uses. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Corporation, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem in the public interest, shall make available any farm commodity or product thereof owned or controlled by it for use in relieving distress (1) in any area in the United States declared by the President to be an acute distress area because of unemployment or other economic cause if the President finds that such use will not displace or interfere with normal marketing of agricultural commodities and (2) in connection with any major disaster determined by the President to warrant assistance by the Federal Government under Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855) *and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of cattle (including producing dairy cattle), sheep, and goats, and their offspring, in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such areas, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for such livestock.* Except on a reimbursable basis, the Corporation shall not bear any costs in connection with making such commodity available beyond the cost of the commodities to the Corporation in store and the handling and transportation costs in making delivery of the commodity to designated agencies at one or more central locations in each State. Nor shall the foregoing restrictions apply to sales of commodities the disposition of which is desirable in the interest of the effective and efficient conduct of the Corporation's operations because of the small quantities involved, or because of age, location or questionable continued storability, but such sales shall be offset by such purchases of commodities as the Corporation determines are necessary to prevent such sales from substantially impairing any price-support program, but in no event shall the purchase price exceed the then current support



price for such commodities. For the purposes of this section, sales for export shall not only include sales made on condition that the identical commodities sold be exported, but shall also include sales made on condition that commodities of the same kind and of comparable value or quantity be exported, either in raw or processed form. (7 U.S.C. 1427.)









# Union Calendar No. 292

87TH CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

## S. 2197

[Report No. 753]

---

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 17, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 22, 1961

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

---

## AN ACT

To amend section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That section ~~107(a)(3)~~ of the Soil Bank Act, as amended,  
4       is further amended by adding at the end thereof the follow-  
5       ing: "*The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, per-*  
6       *mit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage*  
7       *adjacent to or nearby the disaster area for use in the disaster*  
8       *area, the value of such hay, as determined by the Secretary,*  
9       *being deducted from the annual payment applicable to such*  
10       *acreage. The authority of the Secretary to permit the re-*  
11       *moval of hay from conservation reserve acreage because of*

1 damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought,  
2 flood, or other natural disaster shall expire on June 30,  
3 1962. Any deduction made from conservation reserve pay-  
4 ments because of any hay removal under this paragraph or  
5 because of grazing under section 107(a)(4) may, in the  
6 discretion of the Secretary, be reduced by an amount equal  
7 to any sums expended by the producer, but not to exceed  
8 one dollar per acre, for the purposes of grasshopper control  
9 operations on the acreage from which the hay is removed  
10 or which is grazed."

11 SEC. 2. Section 107(a)(4) of the Soil Bank Act is  
12 amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Un-  
13 der the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve  
14 acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering  
15 caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster,  
16 the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the  
17 grazing of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby  
18 the disaster area by livestock normally maintained in the  
19 disaster area, the value of such grazing to be deducted from  
20 the annual payment applicable to such acreage."

21 SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as  
22 amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the  
23 end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the  
24 following: "and shall make feed owned or controlled by it  
25 available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the



1 current support price for such feed (or a comparable price  
2 if there is no current support price) for assistance in the  
3 preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the  
4 United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurri-  
5 cane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other  
6 catastrophe in such area, the President, pursuant to Public  
7 Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, determines that an emer-  
8 gency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be  
9 made available only to persons who do not have, and are  
10 unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without  
11 undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned  
12 by them."

13 SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall be  
14 effective only until June 30, 1962.

15 *That section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as*  
16 *amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the*  
17 *end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the*  
18 *following: "and shall make feed owned or controlled by it*  
19 *available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the*  
20 *current support price for such feed (or a comparable price*  
21 *if there is no current support price) for assistance in the*  
22 *preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of cattle*  
23 *(including producing dairy cattle), sheep, and goats, and*  
24 *their offspring, in any area of the United States where,*  
25 *because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm,*

1 *disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such areas,*  
2 *the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which*  
3 *warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only*  
4 *to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through*  
5 *normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship,*  
6 *sufficient feed for such livestock.”*

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act to amend section  
407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.”

Passed the Senate July 14, 1961.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,

*Secretary.*





---

# AN ACT

---

To amend section 107 (a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

---

JULY 17, 1961

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 22, 1961

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed







July 31, 1961

9. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Proxmire inserted an article discussing the proposal for development of the natural resources of Wisc., "The Wisconsin Plan," which stated that "A key proposal in the Wisconsin plan is that the State undertake an extensive program for acquiring scenic and other easements." p. 13166
10. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Miller inserted an article critical of the foreign aid program, "The Erratic Course of Foreign Aid." pp. 13168-9
11. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. This bill, H. R. 7035, was made the unfinished business for consideration today. p. 13165
12. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that the foreign aid authorization bill will probably be taken up late Tues. or early Wed. pp. 13149-50

### HOUSE

13. LIVESTOCK FEED. Passed as reported S. 2197, to provide that feed owned or controlled by CCC shall be made available at any price not less than 75 percent of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of cattle, sheep, and goats in any area of the U. S. where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such areas, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, provided that such feed will be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for the livestock. Provisions of the bill as passed by the Senate which would have authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the removal of hay from, or grazing on, conservation reserve lands adjacent to, or near, disaster areas were deleted. p. 13062
14. HOG CHOLERA. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7176, to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. p. D639
15. TOBACCO. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment H. R. 1022, to provide for the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments. p. D639
16. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 7208, the legislative appropriation bill for 1962. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 13050
17. PUBLIC LANDS. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 702, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a tract of forest land in Wyoming to the town of Afton; H. R. 4821, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a parcel of forest land to the town of Tellico Plains, Tennessee; H. R. 3879, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes the Soil Conservation Service Farson Pilot Farm land in Sweetwater County, Wyoming; H. R. 4682, with amendment, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain tracts of forest lands in Iowa to the State; H. R. 4939, to provide for the conveyance by the Farmers Home Administration of all right, title, and interest of the U. S. in a certain tract of land in Jasper County, Georgia, to the Jasper County Board of Education; and H. R. 6193, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a tract of forest land in Wyoming to the county of Fremont, Wyoming. p. D639



18. LAND. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 3920, to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center, p. D639
19. BOTANICAL GARDEN. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 5628, to provide for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintain<sup>ing</sup> the National Tropical Botanical Garden. p. D639
20. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1873, to permit CCC commodities donated for use in home economics courses to also be used for training college students if the same facilities and instructors are used for training both high school and college students in home economics courses. p. D639
21. SUGAR. Several Representatives discussed the importance of sugar to the national economy and urged enactment of new sugar legislation this session of Congress. pp. 13065-77
22. TARIFFS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 6611, to reduce (until July 1, 1963) from \$500 to \$100 the amount of goods that a returning resident may bring back to this country free of duty. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13050  
Received from the Secretary of the Treasury a proposed bill "to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and certain related laws to provide for the restatement of the tariff classification provisions"; to Ways and Means Committee. p. 13096
23. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Foreign Affairs Committee "Met in executive session, and ordered a clean bill, H. R. 8400, introduced in lieu of H. R. 7372, to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the U. S. by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security." pp. D639-40
24. SMALL BUSINESS. Rep. Schwengel advocated a small business extension service, saying, "The Agricultural Extension Service is a fine example of what such an Extension Service can accomplish ... It is my contention that this proven valuable service should be extended to all facets of small business." pp. 13079-80
25. REPORTS. Received from the Government Operations Committee a report "on availability of information from Federal Departments and agencies" (H. Rept. 818). p. 13096

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

26. RIVER BASIN. Extension of remarks of Sen. Magnuson inserting an article, "Basin Project Due For New Impetus," describing what can be achieved through completion of the Columbia River Basin project. pp. A5845-6
27. MANPOWER. Extension of remarks of Sen. Randolph inserting an editorial praising Sen. Clark for his efforts in the advancement of legislation to provide manpower development programs. p. A5348
28. RECREATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Anderson inserting an article, "Park Plan For Tomorrow: Federal Officials Drafting Long-Range Land-Acquisition Program To Balance U. S. Industrial Expansion." p. A5852-3



extend enlistments, appointments, periods of active duty, periods of active duty for training, periods of obligated service, or other military status, in any component of an armed force or in the National Guard that expire before July 1, 1962, for not more than twelve months.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I am disturbed over the recent charge by the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor that according to his investigator there is some discrimination in the armed services of the United States because of race, creed, color, or national origin. Would the gentleman assure me that he will look into this on his own responsibility to make sure that this is not happening, or if it is, that immediate corrective measures will be taken through the President of the United States to assure equal status and equal treatment for all members of the armed services?

Mr. VINSON. In view of the question the distinguished gentleman from New York has propounded to me, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I will advise you and advise the Members of the House and the public that I shall on tomorrow morning address a communication to the Secretary of Defense requesting information along the line of the gentleman's question to me and I will be delighted to give it to the public and I will be happy to send the gentleman a copy of the letter.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, now that Congress is going to augment the military forces, I would like to call the attention of the Committee on Armed Services and the Members of the House to a report by the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of which I am a member. The staff of our subcommittee, assisted by the General Accounting office, visited 17 Defense Department activities in recent months and in practically every instance it was noted that the number of military personnel employed in each activity exceeded the authorization.

Our subcommittee found combat-trained military personnel employed as typists, chauffeurs, statisticians, tradesmen, and other work similar in nature to that performed by career civilian employees.

Here are some specific cases brought to our attention in recent weeks.

March Air Force Base: Utilities maintenance and repair section, 48 military have been added, civilians discharged, the military doing electrical work, plumbing, painting, and carpentry work.

Hill Air Force Base: In the motor pool, police, base, and transient maintenance and storage, 374 airmen have replaced civilian employees.

If we need additional military personnel, I think it is high time the Armed Services Committee got busy and found

out why military are replacing civilian employees in jobs of this kind.

Warner-Robins air materiel area: In base and transient branch, 183 civilian employees being replaced by military.

Inspector General function, Air Force-wide: Career civilians working in this function are being replaced by 52 officers.

Medical historical unit of Army here in Washington has replaced career civilian historians with 14 officers to write histories.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base: 52 airmen recently replaced building tradesmen at the housing projects; 22 civilian police were replaced by 36 airmen, and in the comptroller office at this same base 10 enlisted men replaced 10 civilian employees.

McConnell Air Force Base: In 3 years more than 200 civilians have been replaced by military personnel in such work areas as jet engine repair, maintenance of buildings and grounds and the fire department.

Antisubmarine warfare facility at Yorktown, Va.: 19 military assigned to work normally performed by civilian employees.

The above cases are only a few that have been brought to our attention. The question, how many thousands of other cases are there scattered around the world? We do know that throughout the Military Departments, in most support-type jobs, there is a military chief and a civilian assistant. Our subcommittee calls this dual staffing and has repeatedly warned the military departments that excessive manpower requirements can and do result from this dual-supervisor procedure.

The Defense Department in its belt-tightening operation may well take a long and penetrating look into the use of able-bodied military people working at desks or with tradesmen tools in jobs comparable to our civilian economy.

Incidentally, if Congress adopts this resolution to step up the military manpower of this country, then the time has arrived to serve notice upon President Kennedy and his brother-in-law, R. Sargent Shriver, that there is no need for that boondoggle known the Peace Corps. Let those so-called volunteers in the Peace Corps take their places in the draft lines and in the calls for Reserves.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (S.J. Res. 120) to authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months, and for other purposes, he reported the same back to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 403, nays 2, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—403

Abbott	Davis, John W.	Ichord, Mo.
Abernethy	Davis, Tenn.	Ikard, Tex.
Adair	Dawson	Inouye
Addabbo	Deaney	Jarman
Addonizio	Dent	Jennings
Albert	Denton	Jensen
Alexander	Derounian	Joelson
Alford	Derwinski	Johansen
Andersen,	Devine	Johnson, Calif.
Minn.	Diggs	Johnson, Md.
Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	Johnson, Wis.
Andrews	Dole	Jonas
Anfuso	Dominick	Jones, Ala.
Arcadis	Donohue	Jones, Mo.
Ashbrook	Dooley	Judd
Ashley	Dorn	Karsten
Ashmore	Dowdy	Karth
Aspinall	Downing	Kastenmeier
Auchincloss	Doyle	Kearns
Avery	Durno	Kee
Ayres	Dwyer	Keith
Bailey	Edmondson	Kelly
Baldwin	Elliott	Kilburn
Baring	Elsworth	Kilday
Barrett	Everett	Kilgore
Barry	Fallon	King, Calif.
Bass, N.H.	Farbstein	King, N.Y.
Bates	Fascell	Kirwan
Battin	Feighan	Kitchin
Becker	Fenton	Kluczynski
Beckworth	Findley	Knox
Beermann	Finnegan	Kornegay
Belcher	Fisher	Kowalski
Bell	Flood	Kunkel
Bennett, Fla.	Fogarty	Kyl
Bennett, Mich.	Ford	Laird
Berry	Forrester	Landrum
Betts	Fountain	Lane
Boggs	Frazier	Langen
Boland	Frelinghuysen	Lankford
Bolling	Friedel	Latta
Bolton	Fulton	Lennon
Bonner	Gallagher	Lesinski
Bow	Garmatz	Libonati
Boykin	Gary	Lindsay
Brademas	Gathings	Lipscomb
Bray	Gavin	McCormack
Breeding	Giulmo	McCulloch
Brewster	Gilbert	McDonough
Bromwell	Glenn	McDowell
Brooks, La.	Goodell	McFall
Brooks, Tex.	Goodling	McIntire
Broomfield	Granahan	McMillan
Brown	Grant	McVey
Broyhill	Gray	MacGregor
Bruce	Green, Pa.	Machrowicz
Buckley	Griffin	Mack
Burke, Ky.	Griffiths	Madden
Burke, Mass.	Gross	Magnuson
Burleson	Gubser	Mahon
Byrne, Pa.	Hagan, Ga.	Mailliard
Byrnes, Wis.	Hagen, Calif.	Marshall
Cahill	Haley	Martin, Mass.
Carey	Hall	Martin, Nebr.
Casey	Halleck	Mathias
Cederberg	Halpern	Matthews
Chamberlain	Hansen	May
Chelf	Harding	Meador
Chenoweth	Hardy	Merrrow
Chiperfield	Harris	Michel
Church	Harrison, Va.	Miller, Clem
Clancy	Harrison, Wyo.	Miller,
Clark	Hatch	George P.
Coad	Harvey, Ind.	Milliken
Cohelan	Harvey, Mich.	Mills
Collier	Hays	Minshall
Colmer	Hébert	Monagan
Conte	Hochler	Montoya
Cook	Hemphill	Moore
Cooley	Henderson	Moorehead,
Corbett	Herlong	Ohio
Corman	Hiestand	Moorhead, Pa.
Cramer	Hoeven	Morgan
Cunningham	Hoffman, Mich.	Morris
Curtin	Hollifield	Morse
Curtis, Mo.	Holland	Mosher
Daddario	Holtzman	Moss
Dague	Foran	Moulder
Daniels	Hosmer	Multer
Davis,	Huddleston	Murphy
James C.	Hull	Murray



Natcher	Rogers, Ill.	Taber
Nelsen	Rogers, Tex.	Taylor
Nix	Rooney	Teague, Calif.
Norblad	Roosevelt	Teague, Tex.
Nygaard	Rostenkowski	Thomas
O'Brien, Ill.	Roudebush	Thompson, La.
O'Brien, N.Y.	Roush	Thompson, N.J.
O'Hara, Ill.	Rousselot	Thompson, Tex.
O'Hara, Mich.	Rutherford	Thomson, Wis.
O'Konski	Ryan	Thornberry
Olsen	St. George	Toll
O'Neill	St. Germain	Tollefson
Osmer	Stund	Trimble
Ostertag	Saylor	Tuck
Passman	Schadeberg	Ullall
Patman	Schenck	Ullman
Pelly	Scherer	Utt
Perkins	Schneebeli	Vanik
Peterson	Schweiker	Van Pelt
Pfost	Schwengel	Van Zandt
Philbin	Scott	Vinson
Pike	Scranton	Wallhauser
Pilcher	Seely-Brown	Walter
Pillion	Selden	Watts
Pirnie	Shelley	Weaver
Poage	Sheppard	Weiss
Poff	Shipley	Westland
Price	Short	Whalley
Pucinski	Shriver	Wharton
Quie	Sibal	Whitener
Rains	Sikes	Whitten
Randall	Sisk	Wickersham
Ray	Slack	Widnall
Reece	Smith, Calif.	Williams
Reifel	Smith, Iowa	Willis
Reuss	Smith, Miss.	Wilson, Calif.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Va.	Wilson, Ind.
Rhodes, Pa.	Spence	Winstead
Riehlman	Springer	Wright
Riley	Stafford	Wates
Rivers, Alaska	Stacors	Yung
Rivers, S.C.	Stephens	Younger
Robison	Stratton	Zablocki
Rodino	Stubblefield	Zelenko
Rogers, Colo.	Sullivan	

## NAYS—2

Alger Siler

## NOT VOTING 32

Baker	Garland	Moeller
Bass, Tenn.	Green, Ore.	Morrison
Blatnik	Healey	Norrell
Blitch	Hoffman, Ill.	Powell
Cannon	Keogh	Rabaut
Celler	King, Utah	Roberts
Curtis, Mass.	Loser	Santangelo
Dulski	McSweeney	Seed
Evins	Macdonald	Tupper
Fino	Mason	
Flynt	Miller, N.Y.	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Baker.  
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Tupper.  
 Mr. Loser with Mr. Miller of New York.  
 Mr. Keogh with Mr. Garland.  
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. Evins with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.  
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Mason.  
 Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Fino.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND  
REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ARMED FORCES, OATH OF  
ENLISTMENT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to

file a supplemental report on the bill (H.R. 218) to provide that individuals enlisted into the Armed Forces of the United States shall take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, setting forth the correct language of the committee amendment. An error was made in the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

## EMERGENCY FEED FOR LIVESTOCK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2197) to amend section 107(a)(3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 107(a)(3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby the disaster area for use in the disaster area, the value of such hay, as determined by the Secretary, being deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage. The authority of the Secretary to permit the removal of hay from conservation reserve acreage because of damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall expire on June 30, 1962. Any deduction made from conservation reserve payments because of any hay removal under this paragraph or because of grazing under section 107(a)(4) may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be reduced by an amount equal to any sums expended by the producer, but not to exceed one dollar per acre, for the purposes of grasshopper control operations on the acreage from which the hay is removed or which is grazed."

SEC. 2. Section 107(a)(4) of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Under the authority to permit grazing on conservation reserve acreage in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, the Secretary may, if he determines it necessary, permit the grazing of conservation reserve acreage adjacent to or nearby the disaster area by livestock normally maintained in the disaster area, the value of such grazing to be deducted from the annual payment applicable to such acreage."

SEC. 3. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the following: "and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of livestock in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such area, the President, pursuant to Public Law 875, Eighty-first Congress, determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue fi-

nancial hardship, sufficient feed for livestock owned by them."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective only until June 30, 1962.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the following: 'and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of cattle (including producing dairy cattle), sheep, and goats, and their offspring, in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such areas, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for such livestock.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, on July 27, rollcall No. 122 I am listed as having been absent. I was present and answered when my name was called. I ask unanimous consent that the Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

## CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, rollcall No. 121, I am listed as being absent. I was present and responded when my name was called. I ask unanimous consent that the Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LIBERALIZATION OF IMMIGRATION  
LAWS

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill for the liberalization of our immigration laws.

During the 1960 Presidential campaign the standard bearers of the two major political parties stood by the platform adopted by their respective party conventions on this subject. We all anticipated that the winning candidate







# Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF  
BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(For information only;  
should not be quoted  
or cited)

### CONTENTS

Issued August 4, 1961  
For actions of August 3, 1961  
87th-1st, No. 132

Adjourned.....	16
Appropriations...3,5,10,15	
Assistant Secretaries...12	
Atomic energy.....	14
Budgeting.....	27
Buildings.....	25
Civil defense.....	3
Conflicts of interest...15	
Contracts.....	25
Cotton.....	21
Education.....3,7,20	
Electrification.....	19
Farm program.....1,22	
Fisheries.....	11
Foreign aid...6,9,15,17,22	
Foreign trade.....	21
Lands.....	23
Legislative program..15,22	
Livestock feed.....	2
Peace Corps.....	6
Per diem.....	8
Research.....	7
Rural development.....	13
Sugar.....	18
Tobacco.....	15
Travel allowances.....	8
Water compact.....	4
Water resources.....	28
Water rights.....	24
Wetlands.....	26
Wildlife.....	26

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Both Houses agreed to the conference report on farm bill. Senate concurred in House amendments on bill to provide CCC feed for livestock in disaster areas. House concurred in Senate amendments on bill to authorize increased per diem travel rates. Rep. May and others commended rural development program. Senate debated Defense Department appropriation bill. Senate subcommittee voted to report State-Justice appropriation bill.

### SENATE

- FARM PROGRAM.** Both Houses agreed to the conference report on S. 1643, the omnibus farm bill (pp. 13502-9, 13538-49). This bill will now be sent to the President. See Digest 131 for a summary of the bill as agreed to.
- LIVESTOCK FEED.** Concurred in the House amendments to S. 2197, to provide that feed owned or controlled by CCC shall be made available at any price not less than 75 percent of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of cattle, sheep, and goats in any area of the U. S. where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such areas, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, provided that such feed will be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for the livestock. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13523

3. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 7851 (pp. 13463-4, 13470-90, 13493-502, 13509-13, 13516, 13521-3). As reported by the Appropriations Committee the bill included an item of \$207,600,000 for civil defense activities, including authorization for the Defense Department, with the approval of the Budget Bureau, to allocate or transfer funds to other Federal agencies to carry out such civil defense activities as may be assigned to them. Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Robertson to strike out language of the bill authorizing the allocation or transfer of civil defense funds to other Federal agencies (pp. 13509-13). Sen. Robertson explained that he had been informed by <sup>the</sup> Parliamentarian that the entire item for civil defense would be subject to a point of order if this language was not stricken from the bill. Pending at adjournment was a proposed amendment by Sen. Mundt to extend for a 3-year period Federal assistance to schools in federally impacted areas (pp. 13516, 13521-3).
4. WATER COMPACT. Passed without amendment S. 2245, to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain water compacts by Nebr., Wyo., and S. Dak., in order to extend the time for such negotiations. p. 13490
5. STATE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments this bill, H. R. 7371. p. D658
6. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Humphrey inserted a letter from Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps, stating the reasons why he felt that the Peace Corps should be "separate and distinct from our foreign aid program." pp. 13523-4
7. RESEARCH; EDUCATION. Both Houses received from the State Department a proposed bill "to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950"; to S. Finance and H. Ways and Means Committees. pp. 13458, 13602

#### HOUSE

8. TRAVEL ALLOWANCES. Agreed to the Senate amendments on H. R. 3279, to authorize an increase in the rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business. This bill will now be sent to the President (pp. 13528-9). See Digest 121 for a summary of the bill as agreed to.
9. FOREIGN AID. The Foreign Affairs Committee was granted until midnight Sat., Aug. 5, to file a report on H. R. 8400, the foreign aid authorization bill. p. 13563  
Rep. Haley criticized H. R. 8400 saying, "I will be forced to oppose the new foreign aid authorization bill on the grounds that it is unconstitutional and that, even if it were a legal exercise of our powers under the Constitution, it is unwise and unsound, wasteful and destructive of this country's very economy." pp. 13593-5
10. APPROPRIATIONS. The conferees were granted until midnight Fri., Aug. 4, to file a conference report on H. R. 7445, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1962. p. 13528  
Both Houses agreed to the conference report, and acted on amendments in disagreement, on H. R. 7208, the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1962. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 13490-2, 13529-30



and one of the places that has been swollen immensely by the coming in of service people.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Mr. Charles Morley, president of the Greater Titusville Chamber of Commerce, Titusville being the county seat of Brevard County, in which he makes clear that the school system will lose approximately \$1 million in the coming school year unless the proposed legislation is enacted.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITUSVILLE, FLA., July 27, 1961.

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,  
U.S. Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: The Titusville Chamber of Commerce urges you strongly to throw your full support behind the current move to reenact Federal Impact Fund laws.

As you know, Public Laws 874 and 815 have expired and, if not reenacted, could cost the Brevard County school system more than \$1 million in the coming school year. Your conscientious efforts toward reenactment of these laws would be of extreme value to Brevard taxpayers.

Sincerely,

CHARLES MORLEY,  
President, Greater Titusville Chamber  
of Commerce.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I likewise ask unanimous consent that a letter from Wilbur E. Gold, president of the Greater Cocoa Chamber of Commerce, Cocoa, Fla., dated July 27, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATER COCOA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Cocoa, Fla., July 27, 1961.

Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: Due to the rapid growth of the research and development program for guided missiles at Cape Canaveral, Fla., almost 50 percent of the students enrolled in Brevard County public schools are children of missile workers. This situation has posed tremendous problems in providing adequate school facilities, not the least of which is financial.

In recognition of this situation which presently involves almost 12,000 children of service personnel, missile workers, and other Government employees. Brevard County schools have for the past several years received Federal impact funds to make it possible to carry out the school program.

If the impact funds are not continued it would place an intolerable tax burden on the taxpayers of the county, and possibly a curtailment of the presently excellent school program.

The Greater Cocoa Chamber of Commerce urges you to do everything within your power to continue Federal support of the schools in impacted Brevard County.

Cordially yours,

WILBUR E. GOLD, President.

Mr. HOLLAND. While Titusville is the county seat, Cocoa is the city nearest to the installation. Without attempting to read in full from the letter, it shows on its face that approximately 50 percent of the schoolchildren in that county now come from the families who are serving at that great guided missile base.

Madam President, I have numerous other letters before me, but I shall not encumber the RECORD with them. These are just illustrations to point up the difficulty of this program in a county which has had to exhaust its facilities in putting in an additional water system, exhaust its road money, exhaust its money for hospitals and other things, which it has been called upon to erect to help to meet this great problem.

These people have done it patriotically, but they now come to Uncle Sam to ask him to carry a part of the load, brought about by the children who have come to this great missile base with their parents.

I could cite the illustration of Jacksonville, where the great naval air station is located, and I could also cite the carrier base at Mayport. I could refer also to Pensacola in Escambia County, often referred to as the "Annapolis of the Air," also to Eglin Field, which I have already mentioned; and to Panama City with its Tyndall Field, and so on through many illustrations. I must mention Monroe County, in which Key West is located. It has always been under great difficulty because of the terrain and geography. It has had an immense burden placed upon it by this problem.

Madam President, in my judgment no administration, no leadership, whether it be on the majority side or minority side, can ignore this claim for attention to a pressing problem. I do not believe that either party can ignore it. I believe that we should be given a chance to pass upon this question in a separate vote. If we are not given it tomorrow, we will just keep on pressing it day after day until we have acknowledged and recognized the problem which has been created by servants of the United States generally and which should be met at least in part by a contribution from Uncle Sam to carry out and to go along with the program he has initiated, and with which our people have been cooperating.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, in view of the circumstances which have arisen, I ask unanimous consent that the time allocated to the pending amendment be held over until the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow, and that the remarks from now on be made on free time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 107(a) (3) OF SOIL BANK ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2197) to amend section 107(a) (3) of the Soil Bank Act, as amended, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the following: "and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available at any price not

less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of cattle including producing dairy cattle, sheep, and goats, and their offspring, in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such areas, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for such livestock."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with the ranking minority member of the committee, with the majority leader and with the minority leader, and their recommendation is that the Senate accept the amendments of the House. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TO- MORROW

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

#### THE PEACE CORPS SHOULD BE SEPARATE FROM OUR FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, the suggestion has been made from some quarters that the Peace Corps should be made an integral part of our foreign aid program. I have felt very strongly that it should be set up as a separate establishment, and that is the way that it would be set up under the Peace Corps bill, S. 2000, submitted by the administration, which it was my honor to introduce.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent letter by the Director of the Peace Corps, Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., in which he states the reasons why he, too, feels that the Peace Corps should be separate and distinct from our foreign aid program.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of the letter for Sargent Shriver be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bill Moyers and I continue to hear rumors that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in markup may place the Peace Corps back into the machinery of the foreign-aid program, thus reversing President Kennedy's decision to recommend its establishment as a part of the State Department



separate from but coordinating with AID. So that you might be fully conversant with the reasons behind that decision, I would like to set them forth as clearly as possible. If you have any questions about them, please don't hesitate to call either Bill or me.

First, the Peace Corps is a program of international service, relying on people who are volunteers, people motivated by a sense of service and anxious to do something for their country—not employees earning handsome salaries. The administrative question was, What kind of organization should be developed which demonstrates and makes visible the newness, the distinctive appeal, the volunteer spirit of the Peace Corps? Could you put this new wine in an old bottle and achieve the goals you hoped to realize? We did not think so.

Second. To recruit the kind of people necessary for the Peace Corps means reaching people with a special motivation to join a unique program. It's one thing to say to young Americans, "Come join the foreign aid program" and another thing to say, "Come join the Peace Corps." It was important that the Peace Corps maintain its unique identity in order to recruit the right kind of people.

Third. Many countries abroad welcome the Peace Corps because it is not tied in to the traditional forms of foreign aid. Prime Minister Nkrumah told us: "Come as doers, not advisers." And we received a warm welcome from U Nu in Burma, who several years ago asked our existing aid programs to leave his country. To submerge the Peace Corps in the foreign-aid program would have blurred its image in the eyes of some of those leaders.

Fourth. Our separateness from the aid program has created especially enthusiastic response from colleges, universities, and voluntary agencies that have not found it feasible to work in partnership with existing aid programs for various reasons.

Fifth. Our status as an agency within the State Department gives us an opportunity to work directly with Congress in a way that should help us more accurately to reflect the will of Congress.

I hope you realize that none of these arguments is an attempt to minimize the importance of foreign aid as such; I believe strongly in assisting the underdeveloped countries and our allies as we have been doing. I am simply stating the reasons why we felt, and why the President suggested, that the Peace Corps could best do its job as a separate entity from foreign aid although cooperating fully with the foreign-aid administrator. Perhaps the best case was stated in an editorial in the Newark (N.J.) News of May 5, which I quote in full.

"Whatever the prospects of the Peace Corps winning friends among the primitive countries, they are brightened by the President's ruling that it is to be a semi-autonomous agency. This spares it from being lost among existing foreign-aid agencies and gives it a chance to make a vigorous start at least.

"Now, the Peace Corps will report directly to the Secretary of State. It will also deal directly with Congress for its funds. Both seem sensible decisions. For one thing, it should be a distinct advantage for the Peace Corps to tackle its job free of red tape and accumulated prejudices against other foreign-aid agencies.

"Best of all, it puts the Peace Corps purse strings where they belong—in the hand of Congress. That should give the agency a powerful incentive to succeed, and also insures a swift and merciful termination if the experiment fails."

Sincerely,

ROBERT SAGRENT SHRIVER, Jr.,

Director.

## APPEAL FOR BASIC RESEARCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I should like to comment upon one particular phase of H.R. 7851, the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense in the 1962 fiscal year.

I refer to basic research within the overall category of "Research, Development, Testing and Evaluation."

It is an unfortunate fact, in my judgment, that the full amounts requested in the budget presentation by the Department of Defense for basic research were not approved by our Senate committee or by the House Committee on Appropriations. In my judgment, not only should the full amounts have been approved, but larger sums should have been requested for the next fiscal year.

Basic research provides the indispensable foundation for expanding knowledge for the revolutionary weapons systems of tomorrow. There is not a single major advanced weapons system today—whether it is nuclear weaponry, guided missiles, or any other weapon—which would have been possible without basic research.

In addition, the by-products from basic research, as supported by the Department of Defense, tend to repay themselves manyfold in terms of eventual civilian-type advances, useful to our entire population.

### FORTUNATE INCREASE

The Appropriations Committee should be congratulated for increasing the basic research total for the 1962 fiscal year to \$174 million for the three services, as compared with 1961 fiscal year obligations of \$152.4 million.

The only problem about these figures is that they do not help to make up for a critical lag which occurred in basic research in previous years and which started in 1953.

### INFLATION REDUCES PROGRAMING

It has been computed that from 1952 onward, Defense-supported basic research should have been increased by 12 percent per year in order to cope with rising costs. Unfortunately it did not rise by anything like that level. Had it so risen—on a uniform basis each year, then by the 1962 fiscal year, basic research should have been at the level of \$225 million per year. Instead, as we have seen, it will be funded at only \$174 million per year. In effect, we have not made up for past deficiencies.

### THE PRICE OF NEGLECT IN PRIOR YEARS

This country is going to pay a price, for not doing so. Technology will be seeking basic knowledge which simply will not be there, because it has not been discovered. And so it is my hope that every possible administrative action will be taken—consistent with the Congress' statutory provision—to help make up for past losses. I hope, too, that the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget will, in their preparation for the 1963 fiscal year budget, take note of these facts.

Let us see specifically what our Senate committee provides for, as regards basic research in the Department of the Navy.

The Senate committee, appropriated \$8.1 million more for Navy basic research than was provided in the previous fiscal year. But this amount is still \$2 million under the budget presentation. The Navy total is \$69.7 million for the 1962 fiscal year. Compare this with an overall appropriation for Navy research, development, testing, and evaluation of \$1.3 billion. \$69 million in relation to \$1.3 billion is a very modest ratio. It is a far lower proportion for basic research than a major size American corporation in almost any industry with rapid obsolescence could tolerate.

In the case of the Air Force, the Committee on Appropriations allowed for an increase of \$8.4 million more than the amount appropriated in the prior fiscal year. But this is still \$2 million under the budget presentation. The Air Force's total of \$42.1 million is in shockingly low proportion to the overall Air Force research, testing, and evaluation budget of \$2 billion.

In the case of the Department of the Army, there are no specific figures available. The Army is apparently redoing its accounting in distinguishing between "basic" and "applied" research.

General Trudeau had testified before the House Committee that it was his hope that the Army's basic research might reach 5 percent of its research total. I have a high esteem for General Trudeau, but 5 percent is, in my judgment, too low a proportion. It is the lowest ratio of all the services.

Now, I am well aware that the Army must set aside adequate funds for developing and testing weapons which may be fairly close to operational use. I am aware of the other needs for every available dollar, over and above the needs of basic research.

I simply want to point out that sooner or later, the Army or any other service is going to pay a price for having neglected its investment in basic research. Already, the services are paying a price. Already, they are running out of basic knowledge in trying to anticipate bold new weapons systems.

### APPROPRIATIONS' COMMITTEES' REFERENCE TO REPORT BY GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

The next point that I should like to make is by way of comment on the observation on page 55 of the Senate and House reports, quoting from a report released by another committee on the management of scientific information:

There has been recent criticism by another committee of the management of scientific information. It was stated that unknowing duplication and "tragic and intolerable waste of men, money, and material" had resulted from poor management of these programs and it was recommended that a Science Information Exchange for the registration of all current research projects of the Government be established. This committee requests that the Department of Defense give this matter close attention.

I am delighted that the Committees on Appropriations urged DOD attention to this other report.

The latter report was Senate Report No. 263, 87th Congress.

The report was entitled "Coordination of Information on Current Scientific Re-









Public Law 87-127  
87th Congress, S. 2197  
August 7, 1961

## An Act

To amend section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end of the fifth sentence and adding to such sentence the following: "and shall make feed owned or controlled by it available at any price not less than 75 per centum of the current support price for such feed (or a comparable price if there is no current support price) for assistance in the preservation and maintenance of foundation herds of cattle (including producing dairy cattle), sheep, and goats, and their offspring, in any area of the United States where, because of flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, disease, insect infestation, or other catastrophe in such areas, the Secretary determines that an emergency exists which warrants such assistance, such feed to be made available only to persons who do not have, and are unable to obtain through normal channels of trade without undue financial hardship, sufficient feed for such livestock."

Commodity  
Credit Corp.  
Sale of feed  
in disaster  
areas.  
63 Stat. 1055.  
7 USC 1427.

75 STAT. 293.  
75 STAT. 294.

Approved August 7, 1961.

468-A  
32

3540 E